THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CCVIII.] APRIL, 1862. [Vol. XVIII.

AIDS TO FAITH.*

The second paper contained in this volume, "On the Study of the Evidences of Christianity," is by Dr. Fitzgerald, the new Bishop of Killaloe. Although coincident in title with Mr. Baden Powell's contribution to "Essays and Reviews," it corresponds in matter much more with Mr. Pattison's historical survey of the literature of Christian Evidence. It begins by expressing in the words of Coleridge a tendency of thought now prevalent. "Evidences of Christianity! I am weary of the word. Make a man feel the want of it, and you may safely trust it to its own evidence." But whence and from what causes did this tendency arise? is the question which the author next proceeds to answer, in a brief summary of English Church history from the time of the Deistical controversy to the present day—a summary which would be censured by Evangelical and Methodist critics as wofully distorted and incomplete. We cannot pause upon Dr. Fitzgerald's estimate of the influence of Wesley and Whitfield: his assertion that they threw themselves into a movement which they did not originate, and which, he at least insinuates, would have come into existence without them, needs to be supported by evidence which he does not deign to give. But as their predecessors had laid undue stress upon those external and metaphysical evidences of Christianity, which have this in common, that they are capable of being reduced to logical form, the leaders of the new and active party in the Church ran into the opposite extreme of relying too exclusively upon the inward witness of the Spirit, and consequently of neglecting and disparaging sacred learning. The philosophical speculations of Germany have had, from very different causes, a somewhat similar effect: imagination has usurped the throne of reason; feeling has been substituted for fact; and "thus it has come to pass, that without any open controversy, but silently, as it were, and while men slept, the old matter-of-fact faith has died out in many minds, and religion has come to be regarded as an affair of sentiment, that should be disentangled as soon as possible from its historical elements."

* Concluded from p. 141.

"It would not," Dr. Fitzgerald goes on to say, "I think, be very difficult to meet the patrons of such views, even on their own high philosophical ground. I think it would not be hard to prove that, even if we took the moral wants of man as the sole measure of religious truth, the Gospel which these persons preach is inadequate to meet the moral wants of man. We *require* not merely an ideal of human excellence, but to see that ideal *realized;* and to see further that the issue of that realization has been a triumph over all the ills of life, and over all the menaces of death. We require to be shown *in fact* that man can truly serve God, and that the end of that service is everlasting life. We *need* a basis of fact, an historical basis, for our religious faith; and without such a basis that faith is a mere castle in the air—a splendid vision, as practically inoperative to resist real temptation as every other ideal picture has ever proved."—P. 60.

The main argument of this passage is, as far as it goes, valid; but its author himself abandons it in the frank declaration that "after all, this would be only answering a fool according to his folly." "Our supposed wants or wishes" have nothing at all to do with the matter. No wise man will trust to anything less than solid evidence of fact. Why should we rely upon our moral nature, which, if the doctrine of immortality be true, is only in a state of infancy, and as little competent to judge of eternal truth and right, as a child to anticipate the conscientious judgments of its manhood? "A prudent man, then, will not only inquire what it is that his heart seems to want, but also how far those wants are in point of fact supplied. He will not only consider what he wishes to be true, but what he has reasonable evidence for believing to be true. He will treat the truths of religion as matters of fact, and seek for the appropriate evidence of matters of fact,—that is, in other words, for historical evidence." (P. 62.)

Having thus ordered the internal evidences of Christianity out of court, the Bishop proceeds to make some true and forcible remarks (in which, however, the stoutest stickler for the value of internal evidence would agree) as to the advantage of regarding Christianity as an historical religion. He encounters a little difficulty in the case of unlearned believers, who cannot pursue the path of investigation which must be trodden by one who relies on historical evidence alone; but he gets over this, partly by telling them to believe as they are taught by those who know better than themselves—partly by referring them, in another form, to the very kind of evidence which he has just pronounced to be inadmissible. And he concludes with a pæan of exultation, that after all infidelity has nothing to say for itself, and that orthodox Christianity rests, from the lowest foundation to the topmost pinnacle, upon an immovable basis of revealed truth.

There are many parts of this essay which would provoke, in detail, a sharp critical remonstrance. We have already alluded to Dr. Fitzgerald's strange reading of the religious history of the

last century. He surely forgets, in speaking of the tendency of the Evangelical party to overvalue internal evidences, their almost fanatical bibliolatry, which supports itself on that very historical ground which he labours to exalt and to strengthen. But the great defect of the paper is, that it is manifestly written, not in the interest of scientific truth, but to serve a theological purpose. The author sees clearly enough that to admit the validity of the moral evidences of Christianity leads, by a certain process of argument, to the recognition of an ethical criterion of its truth. If conscience is to be allowed to confirm religious truth, it will be impossible to object when it claims the right of judging, of sifting, of rejecting. Suffer yourself to find an argument for Christianity in its adaptation to the natural religious wants of men, and presently these indulged and petted instincts will rise up in rebellion against a theory of atonement. And so to suit the exigencies of orthodoxy, a whole series of facts is ignored, a whole side of religious evidence is treated with contempt. Every writer on such subjects lies under the temptation to lay disproportionate stress upon the kind of evidence which is most fruitful of conviction to his own mind: one indulges in a little harmless sarcasm on "intuitions," while another professes to hold himself proudly above the influence of miracles. But an essay on the Evidences of Christianity, which at one blow disallows the force of half the considerations which have hitherto passed under that name,—which aims to strengthen the edifice of faith by narrowing its foundation, and to conciliate opponents by insisting that not only the results but the process of belief shall be in every case the same,—is a singularity which we hardly expected to see even in these days of strange heresy and still stranger orthodoxy.

From Dr. Fitzgerald, then, as from most of the other authors of "Aids to Faith," we have received a far less complete treatment of a great subject than we had a right to expect. There is much in the relation of the human mind to religious truth which still requires elucidation. A careful à-priori investigation of the kind of evidence which really produces religious conviction; of the method in which that conviction is called into being; of the difference, if any such exist, between the reception of religious and of other truth, with which, in the first instance at least, the conscience and the heart have nothing to do; of the element of diversity introduced by the fact, that all religious truth, rightly apprehended, carries with it an obligation, and is at once operative upon the will;—all this would have been of the greatest possible value. And if the writer had gone on to apply his general conclusions to the special case of Christianity, he might perhaps have been able to draw a just boundary-line between the provinces of external and internal evidence, and so have quieted heartburnings, which now consume a strength which

would be employed to far better advantage in a united defence against aggression. But from such a picture, faint in outline and dim in colour though it be, of what an essay on the Evidences of Christianity might be made, the reader of "Aids to Faith" can only turn away in vain regret.

Dr. M'Caul's essay on "Prophecy" is one upon which, from its very nature, we cannot enter at length. Like his second essay upon "The Mosaic Record of Creation," and Professor Rawlinson's on the "Pentateuch," it contains a sufficient number of hardy assertions to necessitate a volume (were their refutation worth the trouble) to refute them. He speaks little of the moral and spiritual, much of the predictive, function of the prophets. He brings forward many instances of the fulfilment of prophecy, and is very severe upon rationalistic critics. But his main point is one to which we have already referred in a former part of this paper. Christ and his apostles are the great witnesses to the orthodox theory of prophecy. The choice which we have to make is between German criticism and the New Testament. The student cannot, we are told, "adopt the new and contradictory criticism without admitting either that Christ knowingly accommodated himself to the errors of the times, or that he was mistaken, or that his discourses have been incorrectly reported,—*any one of which admissions is equivalent to a renunciation of Christianity.*" It is the old story once more: there never was a form of orthodoxy which admitted the existence of a halting place between itself and infidelity! But with an ingenuity for which we should give Dr. M'Caul greater credit, were it not, as we have already seen, shared by Mr. Rawlinson, our Lord is brought to the bar, and made to give evidence in a case of literary criticism. He quotes the book of Daniel; therefore "the question of the genuineness and authenticity of Daniel cannot be separated from that respecting the fallibility or infallibility of the Saviour." In the same way, "it was not till men had ceased to believe in Christ, that they began to question the latter prophecy of Isaiah." If this be true, how utterly useless are the learned arguments which not only Dr. M'Caul, but other orthodox critics expend, to establish these disputed points! They have referred the difficulties to an authority from which, in their own view, there is no appeal: they have got a decision in their favour: why waste words in the display of carnal erudition?

Mr. Cook, who has lately succeeded the editor of this volume as preacher at Lincoln's Inn, writes in a very different strain on "Ideology and Subscription." The latter half of this double title will have a more attractive sound in our readers' ears than the former: we have fought our battle with Strauss so long ago, that even the echo of the fight has died away. Of all forms of unbelief, scepticism—call it what you will—that to which we are least prone is the evolving of Christian doctrine out of our

own consciousness. It is indeed a defect in Mr. Cook's essay, that though he has some pretext in Mr. Wilson's paper on the National Church for coupling together ideology and subscription, there are many important practical questions suggested by the latter phrase which can hardly be brought into natural connection with considerations involved in the former.

For these reasons, we shall pass briefly over the first (though in many respects the ablest) portion of this essay. After some general remarks, which are both acute in thought and vivid in expression, Mr. Cook devotes several pages to an "historical inquiry into the origin and development of Ideology." This is an exceedingly interesting account of the academical training and gradual mental growth of D. F. Strauss, the author of the celebrated "Leben Jesu." The preparation for the work made by the rationalistic critics, as well as the personal influence of Baur, Schleiermacher and Hegel, upon the author's character and opinions, are fairly and calmly narrated. The effect produced by the book—the subsequent development of Pantheistic principles in the work on Christian Doctrine—the consequences of Hegelianism pushed to its logical extreme in the works of Richter, Rothe, B. Bauer and Feuerbach—form a transition to the subject of Ideology in England. Here our author is less happy. He has to shew that ideology is, amongst us, a living principle of thought, not a hard name, somewhat less hackneyed than scepticism and infidelity, flung at unwelcome innovators in theology. He makes the most of Mr. Wilson's heresies; he tries to involve his fellow-essayists in a like condemnation; but the reader, turning with relief to the section on Subscription, fancies that the author is not unconscious of a similar feeling. Either half of the essay is stronger than the link of fact and logic which binds them together.

The questions as to subscription are thus expressed: "Whether the Church has at present, and has had from the beginning, safeguards to preserve her doctrines from corruption—whether she has a right, and has exercised the right, to exact from all her ministers a pledge that so long as they retain her commission they will deliver those doctrines in their integrity to the people—whether the act of subscription by which the ministers give such pledge involves a moral or a mere legal obligation." And from this Mr. Cook goes on to investigate the practice as to creeds and confessions of faith in the apostolic and patristic ages, being much more successful, it need hardly be said, in proving their existence in the latter than in the former period. Thence he descends to the theory and usage of the English Church, laying down principles in which the orthodox Churchman and the conscientious Dissenter will alike agree, but which completely cut the ground from under the feet of Essayists and Reviewers, who, remaining within the pale of the Church, claim a right of fearless

inquiry into doctrines which she regards as necessary and fundamental. Subscription is not "a promise that a man will believe —a promise which it is not in his power to fulfil"—but a *declaration.* "Whatever promise is implied concerns not our convictions but our acts. We pledge ourselves simply to this, that, so long as we hold an office of trust, we will not contravene the purposes for which it was instituted." The moral is far greater than the legal obligation of subscription. But let Mr. Cook describe the obligations of clergymen in his own words. It is only necessary to inform the reader that the "Oxford Tutor" to whom he alludes is none other than Mr. Wilson himself.

"The existence of the moral obligation does not, however, determine its exact nature and extent. The question still remains, how far the act of subscription implies conformity between a man's inmost convictions and the doctrinal formularies of the Church. That the conformity does not necessarily extend to an absolute and entire acceptation of any human formularies, as exhaustive or perfect representations of Divine truth, may readily be conceded. Such a demand would, in fact, be tantamount to an assumption of verbal and plenary inspiration, which the compilers of the documents and the imposers of subscription would be the first to disclaim. The conformity must, however, amount to as much as this. Taking the articles of religion in their natural and obvious meaning, as upon the whole with singular unanimity, and in the most essential points with absolute unanimity, they have been understood and interpreted by our great divines, the subscriber recognizes in them a faithful exhibition of Christian doctrine, the rule of his public teaching, the authoritative expression of the faith once delivered to the saints. On two points especially, an explicit and unhesitating act of adhesion is demanded—the canon of Holy Scripture, and the Creeds which present its fundamental doctrines in a concentrated form. Short of this conformity, it is certain that a minister cannot sympathize with the spirit, or give effect to the purposes, of the Church. Common sense, in this case fully in accord with the highest reason, is a sufficient guide to the most cautious and scrupulous inquirer. Nor can I forbear from quoting the words of one whom no man will suspect of any tendency to dogmatic intolerance, any disregard of even exaggerated sensitiveness. In a letter to one who had felt much perplexity about subscription, after alluding to difficulties formerly experienced by himself, Dr. Arnold writes thus:—'The real honesty of subscription appears to me to consist in a sympathy with the system to which you subscribe, in a preference of it, not negatively merely as better than others, but positively, as in itself good and true in its most characteristic points. Now, the most characteristic points of the English Church are two: that it maintains what is called the Catholic Faith as opposed to the early heresies, and is also decidedly a Reformed Church as opposed to the priestly and Papal system.' Such must have been the feelings of the Oxford tutor who some twenty years since bore this testimony to our Church, with especial reference to its safeguard of subscription—'I know not where free scope may be found for the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, and devotedness, when they struggle for utterance in the breast of the spiritual man, more freely than in our own com-

munion: where our sons are taught, *without adding thereto, or diminishing aught from it,* the great mystery of godliness: God manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.' No one holding those principles could feel any difficulty in subscription. Such a man is satisfied, not because he is safe from legal consequences, but because he feels himself in harmony with the spirit of his Church, because he knows that he is offering an honest act of fealty, and is willing, without subterfuge or equivocation, to carry out her intentions to the best of his ability. Should it, indeed, unhappily be the case, that in after years his mind should be so affected as to reject not merely a word here and there, the meaning or application of expressions about which the most learned and candid writers have differed, or even positive determinations upon questions of subordinate importance, but the great truths, the objective facts, the fundamental doctrines set forth plainly and unmistakably in those formularies, then surely the moral obligation is positive. It leaves but one alternative. He cannot do the work which he has undertaken, cannot preach the doctrines, cannot proclaim the facts which are the very foundation of the Church: how can he retain the trust? If people did not understand this to be our feeling as ministers, they would speedily seek for some other guarantee. If it were generally believed that, when called upon to clear himself from 'odious imputations,' a minister might put a stop to all further inquiry by simply renewing his subscription, with a clear understanding that thereby he means no more than that he recognizes a legal obligation, retaining the right of explaining away, or even denying privately and publicly, the very statements to which he puts his hand, the whole body of the laity would scout the very notion of subscription, would reject it as illusory, as a mere sham. The only light in which they look upon subscription is, that it is a means of ascertaining what truths a man holds, and what he holds himself bound to teach,—not surely upon what terms he may consider himself justified in retaining office or emoluments in the Church. They will be prepared to allow time for consideration to any man harassed by perplexing doubts: no man would be regarded with more entire sympathy and tenderness than one whose spirit might be overwrought in its struggles with storms which haunt the higher regions of intellectual life: but so long as he works, prays, preaches, administers the sacraments of the Church, or discharges the kindred and no less responsible duty of forming the character of youth under the sanction of the ministerial office, laymen presume, and would be scandalized to hear it doubted, that he holds substantially the convictions which he professed, when formally, publicly, deliberately, at a most critical moment of his life, he signed his name in token of unfeigned assent to the Articles of his Church."—Pp. 178—181.

We are not called upon in this place to discuss, what is, at least for us, the exhausted question of Subscription. We need hardly say that, tried by the true principles of church communion, the eloquent statement of our essayist will be found invalid both in theory and in practice. Before ever the Broad Church took shape and name, the existence of High and Low Church in one ecclesiastical fellowship was conclusive proof that creeds and

articles are powerless to ensure unanimity of theological belief even in those who heartily and *ex animo* subscribe them. But we are not to suffer our theological to carry away with them our ecclesiastical sympathies in relation to this important matter. If as Unitarian Christians we are powerfully attracted to Mr. Maurice and Mr. Wilson, as honest Dissenters we cannot but assent to the reasonings of Mr. Cook. They are, in truth, the only vindication of our position. If, after all, subscription means little or nothing, and not only social and ecclesiastical advantage, but liberty of speech and inquiry, are best secured within the pale of the National Church, we were indeed fools and blind to remain in the miserable isolation which we have been wont to think was a sacrifice demanded of us by allegiance to truth. We have not a word to say against the conscientiousness of the leaders of this new movement. They are men of deep moral earnestness, and have already given up enough to be clear from the charge of being cowards in self-sacrifice. A desire to preserve the unity of the Church, as far as may be, unbroken (a desire in which we sincerely share)—not a mean and sordid grasp upon the emoluments of an Establishment—keeps them where they are. And yet to observers from the outside, especially to observers whose spiritual ancestry can be traced up to a noble act of renunciation such as these men yet shrink from making, the fatal weakness of their position is clear. All unconsciously they strive to serve two masters, union and truth, and can love neither with undivided heart. Presently the time may come when they will learn that to abandon all, even unity itself, for truth's sake, may be the way to a nobler church fellowship than can be constituted upon a basis of uniformity of belief.

We will conclude our notice of this essay by quoting one passage more, in which Mr. Cook justly points out that the abolition of subscription would necessarily involve a re-construction of the Liturgy:

"In a church where the doctrines taught in the Creeds find an expression in every prayer, the contradiction between the sermon of a rationalist and the words which he is constrained to utter in his ministerial functions, will always be, and ought always to be, fatal to his influence. If the congregation have good reason to suspect that, in reciting the Creeds, the minister looks upon himself as subjected to the hard bondage of uttering what he inwardly disavows, or regards as an 'unhappy' form; that in the petitions of the Litany he uses expressions touching the 'Divine personalities' which are to him little more than metaphysical abstractions, or speculative conclusions of the schools; if they believe that, from the opening prayer to the final blessing, there has been a constant struggle, a series of inward protests, jesuitical reservations or interpretations, going on within the mind of the reader; whatever else may be the effect upon their hearts, one effect is sure, their moral sense will be shocked, they will recoil in indignation from such hypocrisy. Even supposing he should have communicated to them

his own unhappy doubts and repugnances, they will feel that it is a bad and evil thing for them to share in acts of such glaring and flagrant inconsistency. They will soon desert the church altogether, or testify their contempt for the ordinances or the minister, by their demeanour when he preaches, or by their expressive silence in the acts of common worship. One thing must be looked in the face. The abolition of subscription to those doctrines which find expression in our Liturgy would be utterly futile unless that Liturgy itself were entirely reconstructed. No partial reform, not the widest reform which has ever been suggested, or would be tolerated by the most indifferent and sceptical congregation in this land, would free from intellectual bondage the conscience of those who are now calling for the relaxation of subscription. It is not a mere phrase here and there which would change their position; it is the very spirit of Christianity, full of the recognition of its most special and characteristic truths, which drives the minister to the alternative of speaking as a believer in each and all essential doctrines, or of standing self-convicted and self-condemned in the presence of Him whom he mocks by the utterance of prayers which he inwardly disavows."—Pp. 182, 183.

Of the next essay, Dr. M'Caul's, on "The Mosaic Record of Creation," we have not much to say. Our readers would hardly be interested were we to put before them the last form which the defence of the scientific infallibility of the book of Genesis has assumed. It may be enough to remark, that Dr. M'Caul disdains all compromise between Science and Scripture, and boldly claims for Moses an absolute accuracy of statement. Had the great lawgiver desired to express in the most precise terms the latest results of modern discovery, he could not have chosen his words more happily. For the facts and arguments upon which the essayist bases this wonderful conclusion, we refer our readers to his own words. Even to state, and much more to examine them, would occupy by far too large a portion of our limited space.

One passage, however, which refers to a point not of science but of criticism, is too characteristic to be passed over. Dr. M'Caul has been speaking of the so-called Elohistic and Jehovistic documents,—the passages at the commencement of the book of Genesis, distinguished by the use of a peculiar name of God, and therefore supposed to be the work of different authors. He enumerates the differing opinions of nine critics, who, every one believing in the separate existence of these documents, are unable to agree as to their number and limits; and then triumphantly goes on to say,—

"This enumeration is far from exhausting the varieties, but is sufficient to show the want of unity. The reader will perceive that some assert one Elohistic document—others, two—others, three. In like manner some make one Jehovist; some more. Some make the Jehovist identical with the compiler; others make him a different person. Some make two, others three, others four, Ewald seven documents by different authors the materials of Genesis. Now every one can understand that there is a great difference whether the Elohistic and Jehovistic portions be assigned to one or be divided amongst two, three, or more persons.

He who says that there is only one Elohist must believe that in the whole Elohistic portion there is unity of style, tone, spirit, language. If there be two Elohists, then the former is mistaken as to the unity, and there must be two diversities of style; but if there be three Elohists, then both first and second critics are mistaken, and there must be three different styles. The portions assigned to each must also be smaller. Let the three Elohists be A, B, C. The first critic says that the whole belongs to A. The second critic says, No; part belongs to B. The third critic says part belongs to A, part to B, and part to C. And thus the most celebrated critics convict each other of false criticism. Hüpfeldt condemns Knobel; Ewald condemns Hüpfeldt and Knobel; Knobel condemns Ewald and Hüpfeldt. If Knobel's criticism is correct, Hüpfeldt's is worthless. If Ewald be right, the others must be deficient in critical acumen. They may all be wrong, but only one of the three can be right.

"But take into account all the other differences enumerated above, one supposing that the documents are pre-Mosaic, another that they were written in the times of Joshua or the Judges, another in the time of David, another some centuries later; and how uncertain must the principles of their criticism appear,—how valueless their conclusions! With such facts can any sane person talk of the results of modern criticism as regards the Book of Genesis? or be willing to give up the belief of centuries for such criticism as this?"—Pp. 192, 193.

We have quoted this passage as a good example of a device not uncommonly used by orthodox controversialists. A number of critics agree to differ from the popular opinion, but, differing from it, differ also in minor points among themselves: let their theories be held to be mutually destructive, leaving the old belief standing the more firmly because of their fall! Now more than one paralogism is involved in this reasoning. It is assumed, in the first place, that there is something in the received opinion which sets it upon a height of safety, whence it can look down upon newer theories, unaffected by the forces which sweep them away. Why should it not be on a level with the conclusion of any learned and candid inquirer, to be tried by the same tests and subject to the same perils? In all probability, the very antiquity which is its sole merit shews that it has come down from an unlearned and uncritical time: it may be the offspring of ages of ignorance, and any one of the theories which impugn it, in like manner, the result of a long period of accumulating knowledge and progressive inquiry. And if opinions are to be set up to destroy one another, there can be no reason why any one should be excluded from the process, and so survive to claim the rewards of victory. But then—and we are willing to take the present case as an example—it is false to represent the newer theories as mutually destructive. If in a mosaic table the various stones be so artfully put together, or their lines of junction so obliterated by age and use, as to leave room for irreconcilable difference of opinion as to the number and size of the gems of

which it is composed, are we on that account to deny the evidence of our senses, and to insist that it is all one particoloured mass? So here, Knobel and Ewald and Hüpfeldt, differing in much, agree in much more. Their difference tells against their respective theories; their agreement tells against Dr. M'Caul. It may be hard to choose between their various statements of the fact, and yet impossible to deny the fact itself. No theological theory can be better supported by able witnesses than that of the existence of Elohistic and Jehovistic elements in the first chapter of the book of Genesis; and we thank Dr. M'Caul for having clearly shewn us how no less than nine competent critics agree in impugning the orthodox opinion on which he pins his own faith.*

Professor Rawlinson's essay on "The Genuineness and Authenticity of the Pentateuch," evades our criticism by the nature of its subject. We have no space in which to follow the windings of his argument, to estimate the value of his reconciling and explaining theories, or to point out the weak places of his analogies. But even if it were not so, the task would not be worth the necessary labour. The essay adds absolutely nothing to the literature of the subject. The "Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford" has only to treat Herodotus and Livy as he has treated the books of Moses, to cover both himself and his office with deserved contempt.

The Bishop of Gloucester's paper on "The Death of Christ" "is directed to those who profess to attach to the sufferings of the Redeemer some preternatural efficacy beyond that of mere example, yet who would substitute for the received account of their effect some other doctrine." It is eloquent in style and orthodox in matter. No new fangled doctrines of atonement are here, but a straightforward statement of the theory of substitution. There is nothing strikingly novel either in the scriptural arguments upon which it is based, or the moral reflections by which it is sought to be justified. To scientific students of theology, the most interesting part will be that in which the Bishop, marshalling his scriptural evidence, admits that different types of Christian doctrine exist side by side in the New Testament. And they will probably think that he is more successful in proving the existence of the "four types," than in shewing how they really coalesce in what he regards as the central and archetypal truth.

"Inspiration"—perhaps the most important question attempted

* A similar argument is constantly being used in regard to the text of the New Testament. Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, often disagree; *therefore*, abide by the Textus Receptus. As if, in the first place, the Textus Receptus were not of less authority than any one of the new critical editions; as if, in the second, the fact of their all differing from it in any particular passage, even while they differ from one another, were not almost a conclusive proof that whichever of *them* is right, *it* must be wrong!

to be discussed in this volume—has, in proportion to its importance, suffered the worst fate. The Rev. Edward Harold Browne, B.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, and Canon Residentiary of Exeter Cathedral, seems, if we may judge from the present specimen of his powers, to possess few but official qualifications for the performance of the delicate task which he has undertaken. His is an essay in the old and literal sense of the term. He takes all the essayist's privilege of inconsequence, and goes round and round about his subject without venturing to touch it. A full third of his space is taken up with a history of opinions on inspiration. A large part of the remainder is occupied with a somewhat rambling criticism of other men's theories, and a long digression upon miracles. More than once he tells us that there is necessarily a divine and human element in the process of inspiration, but offers no criterion by which the boundary-line between them may be even approximately marked out. The question of inspiration is one "*internal* to Christianity." "There is a degree of latitude which must be fatal to faith; but within certain limits men may differ and yet believe." And then again: "It seems pretty generally agreed among thoughtful men at present, that definite theories of inspiration are doubtful and dangerous." Yet—after much more of loose talk such as this, which leads to no conclusion, and leaves upon the reader's mind only the impression that the author is trying hard to be both liberal and orthodox—Mr. Browne all at once says: "We want to be assured that we have an *infallible* depository of *religious* truth. And if we are satisfied that the apostles were accredited messengers for delivering God's message and communicating God's truth to the world, clearly we have this assurance." We assure our readers that the suddenness with which this orthodox statement comes upon them here, is not greater than that with which it presents itself in Mr. Browne's pages. We have in vain tried to discover the chain of reasoning by which it is connected with what precedes; it stands, unsupported by evidence, alone in its native reasonableness. And before the page is turned, Mr. Browne goes on to qualify it once more, and faces round, as if about to desert to the enemy whom he has enlisted to repel. "Scripture was not given to teach us science, but to teach us religion; it may not have been needful that the inspired writers should have been rendered infallible in matters of science, nor is it at all likely that they should have been directed to teach to the ancient world truths which would anticipate the discoveries either of Newton or of Cuvier. It would have been almost as strange if they had not used popular expressions in writing on such subjects, as if they had written, not in the tongue of their own people, but in a new dialect more refined and philosophical." No wonder that orthodox critics are profoundly dissatisfied with Mr. Browne's theory of inspiration, which is yet—such is his

hard fate—far too loose and timid and vacillating to win the respect of any thoughtful heterodoxy.

The last and most elaborate of the essays in this volume is that on "Scripture and its Interpretation," by Mr. Ellicott, Professor of Divinity in King's College, London, and Dean of Exeter,—which, it is hardly necessary to say, answers to Mr. Jowett's admirable contribution to "Essays and Reviews." It is written in a clear and manly style, is interspersed with passages of considerable eloquence, shews a very considerable acquaintance with the minutiæ of scriptural criticism, especially as applied to the New Testament, and is pervaded throughout by an earnest religious spirit. If in the brief analysis of his argument which we are about to give, he seems to fall into inaccuracy of statement and inconclusiveness of reasoning, it will not be unfair to infer that the failure of so able an advocate is to be accounted for by the weakness of his case.

After some preliminary remarks, he begins by controverting the statement that scriptural interpretation has hitherto been various in its methods and uncertain in its results,—a statement which, one would think, was sufficiently established by the fact that every church and every sect that has hitherto existed has been able to read the documents, to which they all appeal, in its own sense. Catholic, Greek and Protestant, Arminian and Calvinist, Trinitarian and Unitarian, Baptist and Swedenborgian, all find in scripture sufficient warrant for the differences which keep them apart. The principal argument with which Mr. Ellicott attempts to meet this fact is, that there is a substantial agreement among the ancient versions. Who denied it? Can he be ignorant of the distinction between translation and interpretation, a distinction which, varying greatly in the case of different books, is never so wide as in the case of writings which profess to impart philosophical or moral or religious instruction? Is he not aware that it is the express duty of translators of such writings to translate and *not* to interpret,—to reproduce a difficult passage in such a state as to put the original difficulty before the mind of the reader of the version? Does he not know that to have done this is in many places one of the merits of our Authorized Version; as, e.g., it is the easiest thing in the world to translate 1 Cor. xi. 10, and an insoluble problem of biblical criticism to know what it means when it is translated? But when he proceeds from the agreement of the ancient versions, which proves nothing, to allege the substantial agreement of all interpreters, ancient and modern, which would prove a great deal, we find ourselves upon what appears to be very unsafe ground of assertion. Chrysostom and Theodoret agree in all essentials with Meyer and De Wette; Origen does not allegorize; the Schoolmen have left behind them "a large amount of reasonable and intelligent interpretation of the word of God." In one word,

the method and the results of biblical interpretation have been in all Christian ages substantially the same. Then, if this is so, why should the church be divided into sects innumerable, each convinced that the propositions of its own creed best express the essential sense of scripture?

Nevertheless, Mr. Ellicott goes on to admit "the existence of diversity of interpretation, especially in individual passages and details," and assigns three causes of this diversity: 1st, the Bible is different from any other book; 2nd, the words of scripture have in many places more than one meaning; 3rd, the Bible is inspired. Under the first head, he turns round upon Mr. Jowett, and reproaches him with the absurdity of declaring that the Bible is to be interpreted like any other book, "when in the merest rough and outside view the Scripture presents such striking differences from any book that the world has ever seen." And then, with an almost amusing unconsciousness of the *personal* inapplicability of his argument, he proceeds to remind Essayists and Reviewers that the Bible is not one book, but many, of different ages and the most various contents; missing, as it would appear, almost wilfully, that he might gain an easy and contemptible word-victory, the plain meaning of Mr. Jowett's statement of principle—that the methods by which we are content to ascertain the signification of every other form of human language, are applicable in the case of the books which compose the Biblical volume.

We cannot pause to criticise Mr. Ellicott's declaration that it is often right to assign more than one meaning to a passage of scripture, as to enter upon the subject, with any prospect of good result, would necessitate an examination of the general relation between thought and its expression, which would lead us too far afield. We must be content with reporting the results at which he arrives. He believes, for instance, that in Matthew xxiv. our Lord *intended* to refer both to the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world. He finds in the words of Christ and his apostles a sufficient warrant for the theory of type and antitype. He adduces instances of simple historical statement, in which a deeper truth inheres than is apparent upon the surface: "Is it possible," he says, "to deny that our Lord himself discloses, in what might have been deemed a mere title of Jehovah under his aspects of relation to favoured worshipers, a meaning so full and so deep that it formed the basis of an argument?" Matt. xxii. 31, seq.; Mark xii. 24, seq.; Luke xx. 37, seq. Nay, when Paul to the Ephesians (iv. 8) not only quotes a Psalm in a strange sense, but quotes it wrongly, substituting for "Thou hast *received* gifts for men," "and *gave* gifts unto men,"—Mr. Ellicott finds, in what to ordinary apprehension is a mere slip of memory, a case in which "the apostle rightly assigned to a seemingly historical passage . . . a deeper meaning than the words

seem to bear, ... and that he altered the form of the words to make more palpable and evident *the meaning which he knew they involved.*" Upon which he goes on to say, "We have no anxiety as to the decision in the case of any calm-judging and unbiassed reader." No more have we.

Nor can we now enter upon Mr. Ellicott's views of Inspiration, which are themselves stated in so compendious a form as to make the task of further compression not easy. His doctrine is orthodox and yet guarded. He does not shrink from professing a belief in a very high theory of inspiration, and yet he will not absolutely assert that the Scriptures are in every minute detail infallibly accurate. He has not quite succeeded in satisfying orthodox critics of the soundness of his own faith, while he yet secures only an infinitesimal portion of the liberty which a less rigid creed would give him. But the main point in this section of his essay to which we direct attention, is a habit of unfair statement, which he shares in common with many of his brethren. Listen to them, and you shall be told that all the difficulties proposed by thoughtful students of the Scriptures are old and long ago cleared up; that the number of them is very small; that the progress of science is all in the direction of orthodox belief; and that if we will only wait awhile, every contradiction and discord of scriptural statement will be satisfactorily set aside. What can be more unfair, not to say false, than the following passage? If the discrepancies between the first chapter of Matthew and Luke were explained 1400 years ago, why do many critics still maintain that it is impossible to construct a single connected narrative from the double statement? What theologian does not know that the explanation of the genealogies on which so much stress is laid, is an hypothesis absolutely unsupported by evidence, to which, had the list of names occurred in Josephus, no sane critic would have dreamed of resorting? How meagre the list of difficulties, intended, as we cannot but suppose, to convey the impression that when these *four* cases have been candidly brought to light, those which still remain behind are of small account!

"The second class of alleged errors is, at first sight, of more importance and plausibility. It professes to include oppositions to science, oppositions to received history, and cases of direct mutual contradiction. Of these three forms we may again briefly say that instances of the first kind, far from increasing, are steadily decreasing under a just comparison of the true meaning of the words of Scripture with the accredited conclusions of science. Recent discussions of the subjects of controversy by men of acknowledged scientific attainments have tended to show that the oppositions of Scripture and science are really far more doubtful than they are assumed to be, and that though they still hold a very prominent place on the pages of the charlatan, they one by one disappear from the treatises of men of real science who have scholarship sufficient to extract the real meaning of the language of Scripture in the passages

under consideration. . . . . Much the same sort of remark, *mutatis mutandis*, may be made on alleged oppositions to received History or Chronology; many of the supposed oppositions held in former times to be inexplicable have now entirely passed away from the scene, and have alike ceased to stimulate the sceptic or to disquiet the believer; others, like the case of Cyrenius (Luke ii. 2), are all but gone; and as to what remain there is a growing feeling among unbiassed scholars and historians that if we could but obtain the knowledge of a few more facts relative to the various points at issue, the oppositions of Scripture and History would wholly cease to exist. . . . . In regard of mutual contradictions, it might be thought a better case has been made out. Writers from whom we might have looked for more guarded comment have done much to exaggerate the so-called discrepancies of the Scripture narrative, and have somewhat too emphatically denounced modes of explanation that, both from their simplicity and, not unfrequently, their antiquity, have very great claims on our consideration. Sceptics have not been slow to take advantage of this ill-advised course. When, however, all these so-called contradictions are mustered up, they are but a motley and an enfeebled host. We survey them, and we observe some as old as the days of Celsus, and as decrepit as they are old; others vainly hiding all but mortal wounds received in conflicts of the past, and now only craving a *coup de grace* from some combatant of our own times; some of a later date, and a more aspiring air, recruited from Deistical controversies of a century or two back, but all marked with uncomely scars, and armed with nothing better than broken or corroded weapons. There they stand; the discrepancy between two Evangelists about the original dwelling-place of Mary and Joseph, explained and well explained fourteen hundred years ago; the two genealogies, fairly discussed in ancient times, and in our own explained in a manner that approaches to positive demonstration; the blasphemy of the *two* thieves, disposed of very reasonably by Chrysostom, and since his time on the same or a similar principle by every unprejudiced commentator; the narrative of the woman who anointed our Lord's feet, first prepared for the occasion by the assumption that the narratives in all the four Gospels relate to the *same* woman,—an assumption regarded even by Meyer, and apparently De Wette, as plainly contrary to the fact. And so on. When we survey such a company, and are told that, at any rate, we should respect their numbers, their aggregate authority, their cumulative weight, an uneasy feeling arises in the mind that those who parade them must really be aware that there is something amiss with each case, that, however numerically strong they may be, it is disagreeably true that as individual instances they are disabled or weak. If so, is there not a great responsibility resting on those who bring forward catalogues of such instances, and yet do not apprize the simple and the inexperienced that each supposed difficulty has most certainly been met over and over again, and with very reasonable success; that this array, so to be respected for its numbers, is really strong in nothing else,—a mere rabble of half-armed or disarmed men?"—Pp. 415—417.

From these prolegomena, Mr. Ellicott passes on to lay down the general principles of interpretation. And for a time we find no difficulty in accompanying his steps, even though we may be inclined to complain that he conducts us into none but familiar

regions of thought. He recommends a prayerful spirit. He would have the interpreter "be seduced by no timidity or prejudices from ascertaining the true text." He enforces the necessity of a fearless statement of the results of investigation. And then he proceeds to lay down four rules of interpretation, upon which he dilates at some length, illustrating his meaning by a series of interesting and instructive examples; all four being summed up in the single general canon—"Interpret grammatically, historically, contextually and minutely."

So far well; though, as Mr. Ellicott admits, "we have really to a certain extent been agreeing to interpret Scripture like any other book." "The real point of interest has yet to be discussed."

"There are at least three large classes of passages in which they fail in ascertaining for us the true mind of Scripture; and these very failures, it will be observed, force upon us additional rules, gradually more and more of an unique character, till we find ourselves at last frankly accepting the yet lacking general rule of true Scriptural interpretation. But let us not anticipate. We have said there are at least three classes of passages for which the above rules are not sufficient. These may be defined roughly, as (1) passages of *general* difficulty, where the context gives us no means of deciding between two or more competing translations, of equal correctness in point of logic or grammar; (2) passages of *doctrinal* difficulty, where either the tenor of the declaration is doubtful, or where opposing deductions have been made as to the doctrine actually conveyed; (3) passages of what may be termed *theological* difficulty, *i.e.* where the fact specified or the principle referred to involves mysterious relations between things human and Divine which are at best very imperfectly known to us. In all these three cases, especially the two last, the rules we have discussed, though of the greatest use in clearing away preliminary difficulties, often leave the main difficulty untouched."—Pp. 439, 440.

By an induction of examples, upon which we cannot pause, our author arrives at a new rule: "Let the writer interpret himself;" or, in other words, in cases of a certain kind of difficulty, much light may be obtained by considering the *usus scribendi* of the writer, and so comparing him with himself. But even this step does not raise us above ordinary levels of interpretation: the new canon is as applicable to Sophocles as to Paul. So, by shewing how the New is dependent upon the Old Testament—how, for instance, the Man of sin in 2 Thessalonians, and the Antichrist of 1 John, are to be elucidated by the book of Daniel—we arrive at the further rule, "Where possible, let Scripture interpret itself;" or, in other words, "Interpret according to the analogy of Scripture." Still, this is not enough.

"What is the true meaning of the words πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως (Col. i. 15) in their reference to the Eternal Son? Here we have two interpretations, widely different, yet both grammatically tenable, and one (the second) considered merely with regard to grammar, perhaps

even obvious and plausible. According to the one interpretation, our Lord would be represented as 'begotten before every creature,' and the reference would be to the eternal generation of Christ; according to the other, it would be 'first-begotten of every creature,' or, as in the Syriac, 'of all creatures,'—prior to them in origin, yet a created being like themselves. Which view are we to take? Grammar is silent, the context difficult and not decisive (the following ἐν αὐτῷ is probably not '*by* Him'), the reasoning deep and mysterious. The answer of every calm and attentive reader of Scripture will probably be promptly given,—'Undoubtedly the former.' But why? 'Because the whole tenor of Scripture is opposed to the latter view.' But how can this tenor of Scripture be confidently stated? on what does the assertion rest? Is it the result of actual and rigorous investigation of the whole of Scripture, or mere reliance on the opinion of the safe side? 'No, neither the one nor the other.' Then on what is the adoption of the former of the two views really based? 'On the teaching of the Creeds, as the authoritative expositions of the true tenor of Scripture.' In other words, the example has at last led us to the full expression of the rule that has been gradually disclosing itself. Scripture itself has at length taught us, by the gentle leading of its own difficulties, the true and vital principle of all really Scriptural exegesis,—*Interpret according to the analogy of Faith.*" P. 443.

Then, in the third place, this notable principle, thus evolved, is to be applied to the interpretation of what Mr. Ellicott has called "passages of theological difficulty." It could nowhere be of more use. There is at once a happy end of all controversy, if the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds are to be erected into a standard, to which, by every device of interpretation, the indefiniteness and almost changefulness of scriptural statement are to be stretched or narrowed.

We do not propose to follow Mr. Ellicott into his concluding section on some of the peculiarities of New-Testament Greek, which, however interesting and valuable it may be in itself, hardly affords fit matter for discussion in these pages. The main points of his argument are already before the reader.

Nor is it necessary to add to what has been already said any general remarks upon the character of the volume which we have thus hastily analyzed. Its contents are so varied, both in character and value, as to make it difficult, if not impossible, to speak in a way that shall be applicable to the whole of it. If our remarks have appeared to the reader somewhat discursive, if not disjointed, let a part at least of the blame lie upon the nature of the subject. To discuss thoroughly the controverted points involved in any one of these essays, would be the work, not of a single fugitive paper, but of a volume elaborately thought out and carefully composed. One conclusion, not altogether without its consolation, the critic of the Christian Reformer may draw from a general survey of "Aids to Faith,"—that its arguments are strong in proportion as they deviate from

a strict standard of orthodoxy; that a defence of orthodox faith is *now* necessarily accompanied by admissions, and compromises, and modifications, which a few years ago would have been deemed fatal to its efficiency; and that modern learning and ingenuity can do little more in support of ancient error than furbish up the old weapons, and seek to effect in a new form the familiar substitution of empty assumption for assured fact and sound logic.

RAMMOHUN ROY ON RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.

Sir,

The following translation of a small Bengali tract on Religious Worship, written by Rajah Rammohun Roy, is offered to your readers. The original (printed in 1829) is with the books presented by William Adam, Esq., to the library of University College, London. It contains nothing new or profound, nor is it characterized by the author's usual vigour of reasoning; but its chief merit consists in this—it shews clearly for what form of religion the Rajah was preparing the minds of his countrymen.

With regard to the translation, it may be mentioned that no verbal rendering has been attempted. I have, besides, omitted the authorities from the Sástras, which Rammohun Roy had quoted in support of his statements. Faithfully yours,

Rakhal Das Haldar.

University Hall, Gordon Square, January 18, 1862.

Question. What is worship?

Answer. The attempt to gratify another is called worship; but with regard to the Supreme Being, it is the exercise of our intelligence respecting Him.

Q. Who is the Object of worship?

A. The Creator and Preserver of the universe, which is full of infinite varieties of things and persons, so incomprehensibly arranged, and so well adapted to each other, that nothing whatever is unnecessary; and which consists of the sun, the moon, the planets, and the stars, moving in their appointed paths far more wonderfully than clock-work.

Q. What sort of person is He?

A. I have told you before that the Object of our worship is the Creator and Preserver of the universe. Neither scripture nor reason is able to affirm anything more about Him.

Q. Is there any means of ascertaining His nature?

A. Both the Vedas and the Law repeatedly say that His nature transcends our comprehension and description, an affirmation which reason confirms; for if the nature and extent of the universe, which is within our perception, cannot be known, how

can the nature of God be known, who is only inferred as the Creator and Preserver of the world?

Q. Can any one reasonably object to this mode of worship?

A. None can do so consistently, because we worship only the Creator and Preserver of the universe; and to such a worship there can be no objection. Different sets of worshipers have different gods, but each set worship their peculiar god as the Creator and Preserver of the universe; and, according to their own belief, they must acknowledge our worship as the worship of their peculiar gods. In this way, those who call time, or nature, or buddha (intelligence), or any object whatever, the Providence of the world, cannot reasonably object to the worship of Providence, simply as such. The various religious worshipers in China, Thibet, Europe and other countries, acknowledge their respective objects of worship as the Creator and Preserver of the universe; and, according to their own belief, they must acknowledge our worship as the worship of their respective gods.

Q. In some passages of the Vedas, God has been termed imperceptible and incomprehensible; and in others, cognoscible; how do you reconcile these contradictions?

A. Where God is said to be imperceptible and incomprehensible, His nature is alluded to; i.e., His nature cannot be known by any means. And where He is said to be cognoscible, His existence is implied; i.e. the admirable arrangements and laws observable in the universe imply that God exists. The functions of the body argue the existence of the intelligent soul in it; but the nature of that soul which pervades the whole body and which guides it, i.e. what sort of thing it is, can by no means be known.

Q. Are you opposed and inimical to other worshipers?

A. Never. Whatever object men may worship, they worship it as God, or at least as the manifestation of God; consequently, why should we be opposed and inimical to them?

Q. If you worship the same God as well as they, wherein do you differ from them?

A. The difference between them and us is of two kinds. First, they ascribe to Him peculiar forms, and acknowledge certain localities as the places where He exists; whereas we worship the intelligent Cause of the creation, without attributing to the same Cause any form or any particular location. Secondly, we find that the different sets of worshipers of the particular forms of God quarrel with each other; but no set of worshipers can consistently quarrel with us, as has been said in answer to the fifth question.

Q. How is this worship performed?

A. To contemplate, according to scripture and reason, that the Creator and Preserver of this perceptible universe is God, is the worship of Him. Self-control and the study of the Vedas &c., are the duties of the worshiper. By self-control, is meant

an attempt to apply our mind and the organs of sense and action in such a way as will produce good to ourselves and others, instead of evil; in fact, the worshiper is required to do to others only what he wishes they should do to him. By the study of the Vedas, is meant that the worshiper should contemplate God by employing words which imply His existence and attributes, as laid down in the Scriptures, since by habit we cannot comprehend meaning without words. Such words also should be used which signify that the benefits we are constantly receiving from fire, wind, the sun, the vegetable world, &c., are derived from God; and such sentiments should be confirmed by the exercise of reason. The Vedas repeatedly say that truth is the basis of divine knowledge; so truth is to be depended upon, and thereby the worship of God, who is truth, is performed.

Q. According to this mode of worship, what are the rules regarding eating and the ordinary usages of life?

A. Eating and the ordinary usages of life should be regulated by the Scriptures. If any person does whatever he likes, without adopting any one of the recognized Sástras, he may be called a man of impulse. To be such is both against scripture and reason. The Scriptures repeatedly forbid one to follow one's own inclinations only. Reason also says that if every one were to follow his own inclinations, and not the authority of the Scriptures, society would soon come to an end. To the followers of inclination, there is no distinction between propriety and impropriety of conduct; their conduct is justified by their inclinations. Now, the inclinations of all men are not of the same kinds; and in the fulfilment of various contrary inclinations disputes must frequently arise, and such frequent disputes may soon destroy society. The truth is, it is unworthy of man to spend his time in judging between the purity and impurity of food, instead of cultivating sciences and the knowledge of God. Whatever we may eat, it is changed within an hour and a half to what is called impure; this again is changed into articles of food, such as grain, &c.: so the wise endeavour to purify their minds rather than their bodies.

Q. According to this mode of worship, are there any rules with regard to place, direction and time for worship?

A. Good time and place are desirable, but there is no special rule. Wherever, in whatever direction, or at whatever time, the mind is fixed, worship may be offered to God.

Q. Who is worthy to be instructed in this mode of worship?

A. All men are fit to receive instruction in this mode of worship; but our supreme felicity depends upon the degree of faith derived from purity of heart.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN 1640-1.*

The two periods in our national history during which the Church of England exercised its power with the fewest hindrances and restrictions, were the ten years in Charles the First's reign that preceded the calling of the Long Parliament, and the quarter of a century that followed the Restoration of the second Charles. In the first period named, the policy of Laud was all-triumphant; and the Puritans were harried with a savage zeal of which modern Churchmen happily feel little. There was no Parliament to which the wretched victims of ecclesiastical courts, none to which they who suffered from the mean, petty and malignant violence of some of the clergy, could appeal. But we greatly question whether even an enthusiastic admirer of the Church of England would wish attention to be particularly directed to these periods, or would consent to accept the results of either as a specimen of the fruits of Church power. One of our living bishops (Dr. T. Vowler Short, Bishop of St. Asaph), when describing the state of England at this time, says: "The court of ecclesiastical commission had frequently exercised severity and sometimes cruelty on those who were called before it; and the people had indistinctly mixed up the idea of the Church government under which they groaned with episcopacy and the higher offices in the Church."

With the kind of wisdom which Churchmen sometimes shew, Laud chose the period when the people were driven by his ecclesiastical agents to a state of madness to introduce and pass in convocation a body of canons, which may be called Laud's masterpiece. The Bishop of St. Asaph shall describe them:

"The canons themselves are such as prove the violence of those who framed them, who must have been actuated by despair or fatuity to select such a time for their publication. They enact that every officiating minister shall, on some one Sunday in every quarter, insist on the divine right of kings and on their prerogatives, in which the power of taxing was indirectly implied. That the day of the king's inauguration shall be carefully observed. They were very severe against Papists, Socinians and all sectaries. In order to support the Establishment, an oath was imposed against innovations, in which every clergyman or person taking a degree was to swear 'that he would not consent to alter the government of the Church by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, &c.;' a form sufficiently equivocal, and which acquired for the oath the name of the '*et cætera* oath.' It was ordered that the communion table should stand as in the cathedral church; that it should be railed in, and the people approach the holy table when they received;

* Proceedings, principally in the County of Kent, in connection with the Parliaments called in 1640, and especially with the Committee of Religion appointed in that Year. Edited by the Rev. Lambert B. Larking, M.A., from the Collections of Sir Edward Dering, Bart., 1627—1644, with a Preface by John Bruce, Esq., F.S.A. Printed for the Camden Society. 1662.

and that on entering and quitting church they should do obeisance. Every preacher was directed to enforce in his sermons twice every year conformity to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England."

Were the clergy in the diocese of Exeter or Oxford consulted, half of them would perhaps aver that these canons are still binding on Churchmen as well as the clergy.

When the Long Parliament met in Nov. 1640, it required no great prophetic skill to foresee that either constitutional liberty or the power of the ecclesiastical body was about to have a fall. One of the first acts of this Parliament was to appoint a Committee of Religion consisting of the whole House. This presently subdivided into several sub-committees. Each had its chairman. White, Corbet, Sir Robert Harlow and Sir Edward Dering were the appointed presidents. The interesting volume of which we have given the title at the foot of this article, contains minutes and documents relating to the proceedings of one of these committees. We owe them to the diligence and care of Sir Edward Dering, of whom a short account, founded on the preface by Mr. John Bruce, is due to our readers.

Sir Edward Dering, of Surrenden, was descended from a good and ancient Kentish family of Puritan tendency. This appears from an incident in the history of a clerical ancestor of Sir Edward in the time of Elizabeth,

"— a popular preacher in London, a man of distinguished eloquence and zeal, and successively Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, a preacher at Paul's Cross, the holder of the family living of Pluckley in Kent, and a prebendary of Salisbury. These promotions did not suffice to keep him out of trouble. He was plain-spoken to excess. Even the Queen did not escape his lash. In a sermon which he preached before Her Majesty in 1569, he warned her lest she who had been, *tanquam ovis*, as sheep appointed to be slain (Ps. xliv. 22), should come to be chastised, *tanquam indomita juvenca*, as an untamed and unruly heifer (Jeremiah xxxi. 18). Her Majesty deemed the allusion a little too forcible; and Dering was forbidden to preach any more before the court.* Some time afterwards he was persecuted for Puritanism before the High Commissioners; and, after a long suit, was suspended from the exercise of all his clerical functions."

Sir Edward Dering was the son of Sir Anthony, a nephew of the Elizabethan preacher. His mother was a daughter of Chief Baron Bell. Sir Anthony Dering held the office of Deputy-lieutenant of the Tower of London. In that building, whose history is intertwined with that of England, Sir Edward was born, January 28, 1598.

"Named after his relative the eminent preacher, who was the first Edward in the family, he inherited a considerable share of his great uncle's peculiar gifts; an eloquence that was unquestionable and most

* This statement is questioned by the intelligent authors of Athenæ Cantabrigienses in their valuable life of Edward Dering the preacher, I. 355.

persuasive, a natural tendency of his mind towards religious subjects of inquiry, a strong dislike of Rome, an aversion from ceremonialism, and an anti-prelatic feeling in reference to the titles, wealth and worldly occupations of the hierarchy."

He studied at Magdalen College, Cambridge, and then betook himself to the pursuits of a country gentleman and the study and collection of antiquarian remains. He was knighted by King James in 1619, and married towards the end of the same year Elizabeth, the eldest daughter of Sir Nicholas Tufton. By this alliance he connected himself with the powerful family of the Cecils. She gave birth to a son, named Anthony, but died before she came of age. By a second marriage, Sir Edward allied himself to the Ashburnhams of Sussex and the Buckingham family. This alliance opened his way to court preferment, and he became a gentleman of the privy chamber. Again his domestic prospects were doomed to be obscured by the death of his wife, who was hurried to the grave by consumption in her twenty-fourth year. A baronetcy had graced the knight of Surrenden in 1627. Then follows a somewhat long but amusing account of Sir Edward's wooing of a well-dowered city widow, the pretty and affected relict of one Bennet, a mercer. After many hopes and fears, and many bribes to all about her, the Kentish baronet had the mortification of seeing the coy and wealthy widow become the bride of Sir Heneage Finch, Recorder of London.

The jilted baronet did not break his heart, but presently tendered his hand to a daughter of Sir Ralph Gibbes, of Honington, in Warwickshire. This proved a happy alliance. He bought the office of Lieutenant of Dover Castle, and with it a succession of inquietudes and troubles. He had many painful dealings with pirates, privateers and smugglers, who harassed him with never-ending litigation. Transferring the costly office to Captain Wentworth, Sir Edward Dering now enjoyed some years of peace; and his correspondence with Dugdale, Sir Christopher Hatton and Sir Thos. Shirley, shews how devoted he was to antiquarian studies. But he was presently tempted from the happy quietude of his study, and embarked on a stormy sea in which he was presently engulfed.

"During this time, the state of public affairs grew more and more unsatisfactory. People of Sir Edward's way of thinking were especially displeased at the changes introduced into Church and State under the influence of Archbishop Laud. The anti-ceremonial and anti-hierarchical spirit of his namesake of the reign of Elizabeth revived within him. Conscious of talent, and anxious for an opportunity of its display, old stirrings of heart after distinction and power began to make themselves felt."

His ambition was gratified in the autumn of 1640 by his being returned, in conjunction with Sir John Colepeper, a knight of

the shire for Kent. He became at once, though but for a short time, a conspicuous member of that Parliament of which Lord Macaulay observes, that in "spite of many errors and disasters, it is justly entitled to the reverence and gratitude of all who in any part of the world enjoy the blessings of constitutional government."

Mr. Bruce thus describes his early parliamentary career:

"It was chiefly as a Church Reformer that Sir Edward had been returned, and he instantly put himself forward as a leader in this important scrutiny. Within a very few days of the commencement of public business, he presented a petition from a Kentish minister whom Archbishop Laud had sent for by a pursuivant, and in the course of his speech on that occasion publicly expressed his hope that ere the expiration of a twelvemonth, 'his Grace would have more grace, or no grace at all.' He presented a petition from the county of Kent, in which it was prayed that the hierarchical power might be totally abrogated; and on that occasion he declared himself the representative of the opinions of the petitioners, and avowed his belief that it might be said of the hierarchy of the Church of England, as a Pope Adrian said of the clergy in his time, *a vertice capitis ad plantam pedis, nihil est sanum in toto ordine ecclesiastico.* He delivered a learned argument against the recent canons, which he averred that the prelates desired to obtrude on the people on the ground of the pretended divinity of episcopacy and the temporal power granted by princes. He was active in reporting from the Committee of which he was the Chairman. . . . . He was looked up to as an acknowledged leader upon all questions relating to the Church; and his acquaintance with the theology of the points in dispute, the clearness with which he stated his arguments, and the eloquence and learning with which he enforced them, secured him not only the attention of the House, but a high degree of popularity out of doors."—Pp. xxxvi, xxxvii.

In May, 1641, Sir Edward Dering astounded the House by proposing, without notice and from the gallery, a Bill for the acceptance of the House, for the utter abolishing of archbishops, bishops, deans and chapters, with all their officers. This was a hasty and ill-considered step, which he took at the suggestion of Sir Arthur Haselrig, Vane and Cromwell. He thus apparently committed himself to the "root-and-branch" section, the Anti-State-Church party of that day. Sir Edward Dering quickly saw his error, and tried to recede from the position he had rashly taken. He endeavoured, with little success, to persuade the House that he had not aimed at the destruction, but simply the reform, of the Church of England. He was looked upon with suspicion and aversion, as a traitor to a great cause. Each day the gap between himself and his former friends became wider, and he was constantly in opposition to the movement party.

Desiring to vindicate himself in the face of the country, he put out a volume of his speeches, with notes. The volume pleased the King, but in the same degree offended the Parliament. Its

publication was voted a breach of privilege. The book was ordered to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman, and its author was sent to the Tower. He was presently released; but taking an active part in his county on the Royal side, he was impeached for a treasonable conspiracy. After a period of concealment in Kent, during which he is said to have escaped detection by putting on clergyman's robes and reading prayers in one of the churches, he joined the King's friends at Nottingham on the occasion of setting up the Royal standard, in August, 1642. He received a regiment. But his heart went not with the Royal cause, and his physical strength failed him in military toils.

His estate at Surrenden had been sequestered and plundered. He retired after six months' military command, and began to seek to make his peace with his former friends. He took advantage of the declaration of Parliament permitting persons who had been in arms against them to return to their homes on taking the covenant, and paying a fine as composition for the restoration of their estates. Before the fine was settled, Sir Edward Dering had sunk under his accumulated disappointments and griefs. An imposthume in the head terminated his wretched career, June 22, 1644.

The strange vacillations of his political course gave countenance to the estimate of his character by Lord Clarendon, as a man of levity and vanity, easily flattered by being commended. His fate is a warning to others than politicians, that they can seldom (however sincere their convictions may be) serve two opposite parties. Those whom they quit brand them as renegades, and some of those whom they join dislike them more as rivals than they had previously done as enemies, and suspect and malign their whole conduct. From the days of Dering to those of Burke, experience has proved this. The fate of Dering was extremely severe; but, in a modified degree, it is probable that all political weathercocks are exposed to his annoyances and griefs. As an historical antiquary, Sir Edward Dering may retain the reputation which his tergiversation as a politician squandered.

The volume before us is a valuable contribution to our historical knowledge, and brings into strong light those ecclesiastical abuses which in the seventeenth century maddened brain and heart of thousands of our ancestors.

The sub-committee appointed by the Committee of Religion consisted of twenty-four members. They set themselves to discover the sufferings of ministers by ecclesiastical proceedings; to consider the several tests propounded to them; and to examine the violations of liberty in relation to books, licences, printing, and suppressing them. Of this sub-committee Sir Edward Dering, its author, was appointed Chairman. Among the members who served were Mr. Cromwell, Sir Henry Mild-

may, Sir Anthony Ireby, Sir Roger Palmer, Sir Wm. Masham, Mr. Corbet, Mr. Knatchbull, Sir Robert Harley and Sir Wm. Brereton. The documents which now for the first time see the light through the press, illustrate in a very remarkable manner the ecclesiastical condition of our provincial towns and villages under the evil influence of Laud and his party. With some few exceptions, the petitions and letters are grave and temperate documents, which authenticate themselves by their minuteness of statement. In some few cases, we have statement and counter-statement, and are able to judge for ourselves respecting the merits of the case.

We will give as briefly as we can the substance of some of the principal petitions, which throw no little light on the character of the Church of England before its fall, and will help to account for the animosity which the patriots of the seventeenth century felt towards prelacy.

In 1660, the parishioners of Marden brought to the notice of the Committee the shameless way in which the Court of Prerogative at Canterbury abused its functions in respect to the granting of marriage licences. One question eagerly agitated in our day was rife then; and the people of Marden were scandalized at one Robert Waterman being able by a Canterbury licence to marry the sister of his deceased wife. Worse still, John Batherst, a man lacking chattels and land alike, was enabled to contract a marriage with Alice Medhurst, *not quite nine years of age*, but an heiress on a small scale.

At Minster, the inhabitants petitioned against their vicar, Dr. Meric Casaubon (son of the more celebrated Isaac Casaubon).

Dr. Meric was a well-beneficed pluralist holding three livings, zealous for the innovations in respect to the altar and service which characterized the Laudian party. A more distasteful innovation was raising the tithe of marsh land 50 per cent., and thinking to add another 100 per cent. The good people crave the services of some "able and godly-minded minister," and an absolute settlement of the tithe-rate.

Against the same pastor, the people of Monkton prefer similar complaints; and add that, while the vicar seldom visits them, "he keeps a curat there, a weake and an unable man, unworthy of imitacion eyther in life or doctrine." The tithe on marsh land was advanced fourpence an acre; but the advance was equally distasteful to the people.

The people of Little Chart complain that their rector, Samuel Keame, is non-resident during six years; the church unserved, or the duty discharged by drunken and incapable ministers.

At Smarden, the people allege that the incumbent was non-resident, and that the curate, John Terry, was negligent in the performance of his duties; that when the dead awaited burial at the church, "he hath bene so distempered with beere" that he

could not read the service; that he was sometimes of necessity led home by two men; and that he was a breaker of the peace, striking and fighting men and women at the church door. The remonstrances of the parish were treated with indifference by the vicar, and by the court of Canterbury, to which complaints had been forwarded.

At Crayford, Dr. Vane wounded the religious susceptibilities of his parishioners by preaching in behalf of the confessional and against predestination; by administering the elements only at the rails of the altar, to which he forced the people to come up.

The very heart of the diocese of Canterbury was under Puritan influence; for one Richard Culmer writes to Sir Edward Dering, informing him that a petition would presently be forwarded from Canterbury against the Archbishop. The Puritan minister tells his correspondent that in Canterbury "the tyranny of prelacy and the cathedral darkeneth the whole city." Richard rehearses his own personal wrongs:

"I have had very ungracious dealing from the Lambeth patriarch, by whom I have been deprived of my ministry and all the profits of my living three years and seven months, haveing myselfe, my wife and seven children to provide for; *such is the prelate's tyranny for not consenting to morris dauncing uppon the Lord's day.*"

Mr. Larking has failed, as editor of this book, to notify that this Richard Culmer lived to be one of the ejected clergy, and was dispossessed of the valuable living of Minster. He was the subject of many angry charges, some of them probably frivolous; but we fear he cannot be absolved from the crime of breaking the great window of the cathedral at Canterbury. In their dread of superstition, the Puritans sometimes ran into gross superstition. This letter exactly confirms some of the statements in Calamy respecting Richard Culmer.

Mr. Edward Broughton, the minister of Woodchurch, stands charged with Popish doctrine and practices; such as walking the parish at Easter in surplice and hood, reading prayers and psalms at divers crossways, and digging crosses at boundary places. He affronted the orthodoxy of his parish no less by preaching that bishops come next in the ecclesiastical roll to God and Christ, than by asserting the Arminian doctrine of general salvation.

At St. Mary Cray, the parishioners take exception to Bishop Bancroft, their impropriate rector, who, though receiving £150 from the parish, does little for it, excepting paying five or six pounds a year for a man to read the service. A sermon is preached at times but once in two months.

At Shoreham and Otford, the people complain that though they pay £160 and 200 marks per annum to the clergyman, he starves a painstaking curate, allowing him but £20 a year for the double duty, though he has a wife and family to maintain.

The people of Hoath complain that for three years the parson,

Mr. Barnaby Knell, did neglect service in their church, forcing the people to travel four miles to Reculver, where he had another cure. They say that the common highway between Reculver and Hoath is in winter time foul and all but impassable to those on foot. On the other hand, the parson alleged that Hoath never was a cure of souls, that the chapel had been erected only for mass and other superstitious ceremonies at the burial of the dead.

At Goudhurst, the people lament the suspension of Mr. Edward Bright, a "painefull" minister, who for £24 a year did the duty for which Dr. Horsmonden received £100, but did nothing. Here we find another of the ejected clergy. Of poor Edward Bright's "patience," Calamy makes honourable mention. He had other troubles besides in the ecclesiastical courts at Canterbury. He had a sharper thorn at home, "a very froward and clamorous wife." Calamy does not often attempt a smart saying, but he remarks here—"On this account many thought it an happiness to him to be dull of hearing."

The parishioners of Leeds and Broomfield, having no preaching in their own churches, resorted to other churches; and then they were, for this schismatic style of worship, "cited, troubled and molested, to the saddening of their hearts and wasting of their estates."

The people of Capel record a strange complaint made against them by their minister. "He says that if he be ever so far from his text, yet if he keep but talking on it will serve our turn." Many modern divines follow the practice of the parson of Capel, but we never heard one complain on this head. This same divine offended his people by two antipathies which soon broke out against Scotchmen and Puritans. "He doth raile against the Scots in his pulpit and out of his pulpit, calling them dogs and devills; and says he knows not how to call them bad enough. He says that if ever Scots goe to heaven, the devil will goe too. He says there is more hope of a Papist than there is of a Puritant."

The parishioners of Oure had for twenty years but one parson, and his stipend being but £8, and having wife and children, took to stealing meat, was arraigned and condemned for felony, to the scandal of religion and the reproach of the Reformed ministry.

At Ivy-church, the old story is repeated, of a well-to-do non-resident parson, and a painstaking curate starving on £30 a year.

The parson of Leysdown, in Shepey, is described by his neighbours as an unfrequent preacher, commonly putting them off with a homily; but what skill he lacked in divinity, he possessed in abundance in ecclesiastical law, and loved to cite poor men into the courts, and extorted tithe on working horses and on fish. If any parishioners affronted him, he threatened to have his revenge by making them churchwardens.

Against the parson of Boughton Blean the indictment is long. One of the counts charges him with haunting ale-houses and playing at tables; another, with drinking of healths and singing of idle catches.

Edward Barbet, of Chistlet, affronted his parishioners by what is now too common to attract remark—"Touchinge his reading of divine service, he reads soe false and with such ill gesture."

At Biddenden, where were 1200 communicants, the people were aggrieved by "scandalous and offensive curates placed by the Bishop of Oxford."

Mr. Jeffery Amherst called those of the Horsmonden people who would not come to the rails for the communion, "Puritans and itching Puritans."

Many of the pastors were accused of denying their people the well of water springing up to eternal life; but at Sevenoaks, Dr. Gibbon, the rector, forbad the people of Sevenoaks using a spring on the glebe land to which they had previously had free access.

Mr. Chase, the parson of Stone and a bishop's nephew, seems to have gained the repute of the most litigious and unscrupulous incumbent in all the county. The history of his "brabbleing suites" fills many pages. There were several of the Chase family living together: there was Matthew Chase the father and Matthew Chase the brother. The suits of the parson were commonly taken up by Matthew Chase, and if costs were won against him, the poor suitor knew not from whom to seek his costs.

Thomas Vahan, the curate of Chatham, had some singular ideas respecting interpretation. "Being urged by the apostle's words that his dutie did consist in preaching, and to be instant in season and out of season,—'In season,' he saith, is to preach upon Sundaies in the forenoons, and 'out of season,' in the afternoons."

Dr. Peake, of Tenterden, is charged with neglect of duty. On a Fast-day he sent a minister "who preached one sermon little more than half an houre." The good people of Tenterden were scandalized at this short measure, and alleged that "the exercises of the Fast not being continued a competent and convenient time as hath been heretofore used, a good part of the day was by the rude sort spent in the ale-houses, to the great dishonour of Almighty God."

The documents which this volume contains are creditable to the sagacity and literary aptitude of the writers. It is a question whether from the secluded hamlets of Kent at the present day, letters and petitions equally skilful and correct could now be obtained. It is certain that, under the stimulus of Puritanism, an amount of intelligence had in the 17th century diffused itself amongst the mass of the people in this country, and especially in the agricultural districts, such as had never before developed

itself, and such as we should in the same places now look for in vain.

As to the complaints made against the clergy, and respecting the kind or amount of religious instruction given to the people, different opinions may exist. In some cases we may see reason to suspect the inflaming influences of religious partizanship, and detect inconsistencies and exaggerations. But after making some deductions on this account, we shall still have left a solid foundation of facts which will justify the feeling of admiration of the earnest religious spirit of the country. The people were, in fact, in advance of many of their teachers.

If wisdom and charity and a pure love of religion had influenced the hierarchy of the English Church during the early part of the critical century in English history, how different would the results have been! Wise and good men, instead of thwarting and irritating the religious zeal and spiritual earnestness of their countrymen, would have put themselves at their head, won their confidence by sympathy, and then prudently and by degrees amended their faults and moderated them in those things wherein they were running to excess. When the Puritans of England asked for the ministrations of an earnest, vital religious faith, the clergy and their leaders offered them instead a mere ritual and a hard ecclesiastical policy. The people hungered for the bread of life, and their priests gave them rubrics, canons, genuflections before the altar, bowings at the name of Jesus, and citations into ecclesiastical courts. Never was a glorious opportunity so lost as that which the Church of England then threw away.

Laud, and those that followed his desperate leading, cared comparatively little for doctrinal conformity. On some points they exhibited latitudinarian tendencies; but they seemed to act on the principle that in everything Puritanism must be resisted and put down. To this policy they were instigated by a craving for irresponsible and unlimited clerical power. For the sake of this they were ready to peril not merely the civil institutions of their country, but religion itself. Puritanism had many and serious faults; but compared with the selfish and ruthless ecclesiasticism to which it was opposed, it had elements of greatness and power that should commend it to the esteem of all religious men.

THE REV. H. B. WILSON IN THE COURT OF ARCHES.

While judgment upon Dr. Rowland Williams is deferred, another ecclesiastical offender is brought up for trial. And in his case also judgment is deferred. No wonder that Dr. Lushington is at a loss to know what the law in matters ecclesiastical really is. No wonder that the rules of ordinary evidence should fail him in the court ecclesiastical. It is understood that he waits till Mr. Heath's appeal from his sentence of deprivation shall have been decided by the Privy Council. This hearing was to begin on the 26th of March. Writing as we do before the case is opened, we can only remark on the whimsicality of the idea that the Privy Council is in this land the supreme theologian, and hazard the opinion that if that most learned and orthodox body should succeed, to their own satisfaction, in settling all points of theology that are concerned in Mr. Heath's case, it will not follow as matter of logical necessity that Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson will be likewise disposed of. Should Mr. Heath's deprivation be confirmed, it would not carry the deprivation of the other two clergymen, whose alleged heresies are perfectly distinct from his. Nor, if the judgment against Mr. Heath be reversed, will it necessarily relieve the other two from an adverse sentence on perfectly distinct grounds. Such a decision might indeed serve to shew that our Gallios care for none of these things; that they care neither to make Churchmen conform to the law, nor to bring the law to the requirements of the age; but only choose to bolster up a hollow truce between theology and science, between the church and the age, which may last out their own time. "After us the deluge," if it must be so; but in our time stagnation, compromise, suppression, expedients to keep things as they are! This is the result that we most of all deprecate,—the slurring over of difficulties, the evasion and postponement of that *revision* of the constitution of the Church of England which has been postponed and evaded time after time these three hundred years past, till the required alterations are truly formidable, and the diversity of opinion that prevails respecting them seems almost to defy the hope of a satisfactory solution. Yet it must be taken in hand.

The Rev. H. B. Wilson, B.D., is the son of Dr. Wilson, for many years rector of St. Mary, Aldermanbury, in the city of London. He was educated, according to Cockford's "Clerical Directory," at St. John's College, Oxford, where he graduated in 1825, taking a second class in Classics. He was for many years Fellow and Tutor of St. John's; Public Examiner, 1836 and 1850; Select Preacher in 1835 and 1842; and Bampton Lecturer in 1850. In 1850 he was presented by the President and Fellows of St. John's College to the vicarage of Great Staughton, near St. Neot's (value £480 with residence), and that

living he has held up to the present time. He is the author of the following works: "Letter to Churton" (a pamphlet); "Independence of Particular Churches" (a sermon); "Communion of Saints" (Bampton Lecture), 1851; "Letter to Lord Derby on University Reform," 1854; "Schemes of Christian Comprehension," in Oxford Essays, 1857.

Before reciting the articles of accusation against him, we think it well to refresh the reader's mind with an abstract of his *Essay or Review* which forms the groundwork of the charge. It is the fourth in the volume, and is intitled, *Séances Historiques de Genève: The National Church.*

In the course of these *Séances,* "it fell to the Comte Leon de Gasparin to illustrate the reign of Constantine. He laid it down in the strongest manner that the individual principle supplies the true basis of the Church, and that by inaugurating the union between Church and State, Constantine introduced into Christianity the false and pagan principle of Multitudinism." M. Bungener took the opposite side; and Mr. Wilson makes this discussion the occasion of an article on the National Church of England.

These ugly and un-English words, Individualism and Multitudinism, are truly repulsive to the reader. We have been long used to discussions on the union of Church and State, and to others on collective creeds and individual freedom. And we do not feel that the two classes of questions are identical. We do not feel that a State Church necessarily provides for *multitudinism* of wants, beliefs and aspirations; nor that *individualism* (if that means individuality of conviction) necessarily implies, as Mr. Wilson seems to say (p. 165), the separation of the Church from the State, still less the adoption of the Calvinistic system of theology.

Under this term Multitudinism, however, Mr. Wilson advocates the principle of a National Church. He regards the Church of England as having been one and the same Multitudinism, or Nationalism, through Saxon, Norman, Tudor and Stuart times, alike before and after the Reformation from Popery; and, as the signs of the times now foretel change, he proceeds to "suggest inquiries as to the best method of adjusting old things to new conditions."

He describes the wide-spread alienation both of the educated and the uneducated from the Church of England. He says that neither the influence of German theology nor the diffusion of cheap sceptical literature will account for it; indeed, "the sceptical movements (he admits) are the result of observation and thought, not of passion." There is a spontaneous recoil from the doctrines taught. He lays the blame chiefly on the dull, passive spirit of the Church, which refuses to sympathize with the growing knowledge and intellectual activity of the age, and so makes Christianity seem responsible for the ignorance and

errors of the dark ages. And he refers approvingly to the efforts of some of the clergy for a revision of the Church formularies, and liberty to omit "one unhappy creed" especially.

He appeals to the moral and non-dogmatic character of our Lord's instructions, and to the (multitudinous) comprehension of Pharisees and Sadducees, Jews and Gentiles, philosophers and hitherto pagans, in the apostolic churches. Paul, he reminds us, did not even expel from the church the deniers of the resurrection, though he stoutly argued with them, and represented faith in that fact "as the corner-stone of the Christian belief." And "it was only in an extreme case that he sanctioned excommunication for the cause of immorality."

Hence, says Mr. Wilson,

"— we gather two important conclusions: first, of the at least equal value of the Christian life, as compared with the Christian doctrine; and, secondly, of the retaining within the Church, both of those who were erroneous and defective in doctrine and of those who were by their lives unworthy of their profession; they who caused divisions and heresies were to be marked and avoided, but not expelled; and if any called a brother were a notoriously immoral person, the rest were enjoined, no not to eat with him, but he was not to be refused the name of brother or Christian (1 Cor. v. 11)."

Thus, he says, the apostolic churches were multitudinist; and he also thinks "they early tended to become national churches," as they "took collective names from the localities where they were situate." According to which argument, the Liverpool Financial Reform Association tends to become a department of the national exchequer; and the National Anti-Corn-law League was in its day a government institution! It is in this connection that he says Calvinism alone objects to the union of Church and State. But how is it, then, that we *have* a Calvinistic creed in the Established Church, and that the Genevan Church once had it? And what is to be said of our Baptist and Unitarian members of the Anti-State-Church Society?

Mr. Wilson goes on distinctly to avow that Multitudinism or Nationalism essentially requires the utmost freedom of doctrinal belief:

"Unhappily, together with his inauguration of Multitudinism, Constantine also inaugurated a principle essentially at variance with it, the principle of doctrinal limitation. . . . . The opportunity of reverting to the freedom of the apostolic and immediately succeeding periods, was finally lost for many ages by the sanction given by Constantine to the decisions of Nicæa. . . . . At all events, a principle at variance with a true Multitudinism was then recognized."

Such exclusiveness, he says, was appropriate enough to the Calvinistic churches (he has evidently no love for Calvinism), but a Multitudinist church ought to repeal all such tests or limitations.

"Doctrinal limitations in the Multitudinist form of church are not essential to it; upon larger knowledge of Christian history, upon a more

thorough acquaintance with the mental constitution of man, upon an understanding of the obstacles they present to a true catholicity, they may be cast off."—P. 167.

After alluding to the national churches of heathenism and to the Jewish national church, and claiming on his side "the mind of Jesus himself with respect to Nationalism, as fully revealed in the touching words, How often would I have gathered thy children together," &c., he comes more directly to the question of the English Church.

He lays it down distinctly enough that

"If the National Church is to be true to the Multitudinist principle, and to correspond ultimately to the national character, the freedom of opinion which belongs to the English citizen should be conceded to the English Churchman; and the freedom which is already practically enjoyed by the members of the congregation cannot without injustice be denied to its minister."

And then he proceeds to inquire, "how far a liberty of opinion is conceded by our existing laws, civil and ecclesiastical." He prepares us to expect that "along with great openings for freedom, it will be found there are some restraints, or appearances of restraints, which require to be removed."

He makes the somewhat futile remark, that "as far as opinion *privately entertained* is concerned, the liberty of the English clergyman appears already to be complete." So is that of residents in Spain. But upon the *expression* of opinions, "a great restraint is supposed to be imposed upon the clergy by reason of their subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles." Mr. Wilson proceeds to argue for the very most lax views of subscription, claiming the strictly legal obligation to be the measure of the moral one, and shamefully quibbling upon the words *allow* and *acknowledge* used in the act of subscription.

It is difficult to reconcile this part of the essay with the previous condemnation of the principle of doctrinal limitation introduced by Constantine and only copied in the Church of England. He again (p. 187) contemplates the repeal of such provisions as have fallen into desuetude; but after all would be satisfied to leave the Thirty-nine Articles as the ultimate law of the Church, only abolishing the necessity of subscribing to them. To us this may seem like playing fast and loose with the subject. To abolish the doctrinal limitations would, by his own showing, be the way to make the Church truly national; yet he does not propose to do this, but to leave the Articles as they are, and excuse the clergy from signing them, or supply them with an interpretive pick-lock if signature is still required.

When we read such a passage as the following, we think the writer must be pointing out the defects of the Church of England, not eulogizing her as fulfilling (with the aid of lax *acknowledgment*) the high functions of a truly National Church:

"It is a great misrepresentation to exhibit the State as allying itself with one out of many sects—a misrepresentation, the blame of which does not rest wholly with political persons, nor with the partisans of sects adverse to that which is supposed to be unduly preferred. It cannot concern a State to develope as part of its own organization a machinery or system of relations founded on the possession of speculative truth. Speculative doctrines should be left to philosophical schools. A national Church must be concerned with the ethical development of its members. And the wrong of supposing it to be otherwise, is participated by those of the clericalty who consider the Church of Christ to be founded, as a society, on the profession of an abstractedly true and supernaturally communicated speculation concerning God, rather than upon the manifestation of a divine life in man."—P. 195.

Every word of the above passage, in proportion as it describes what should be the comprehensiveness, freedom and practical religiousness of a Church truly national, simply condemns the existing Church of England in each particular.

Quite incidentally to the direct purpose of Mr. Wilson's essay, he has touched another subject, his treatment of which forms the groundwork of the principal charges against him. Of course it was a necessary part of his argument to shew how variously free minds will inevitably decide on matters of scriptural belief, as on all others. He might, in this connection, have pointed to the various theologies of the Church of Rome, the Calvinists, the Lutherans, the Arminians, the Unitarians; and thence might have powerfully deduced the non-nationality of the Thirty-nine Articles and three included Creeds. He might (as an illustration more tempting to a scholar) have compared the learned and unlearned theories of the divine authority of the Scriptures; the Romish traditionalism which extinguishes criticism, the opposite Bibliolatry which ignores it, and the scholarly use of learning, which is as applicable to the Scriptures as to any other ancient books, and the application of which in the identical manner in which it is applied to other ancient books is the only valid mode of establishing the specialty of the Scriptures as the records of divine revelation. None of these illustrations has he adduced; but has contrasted at great length the *literal* and what he calls the *ideological* modes of interpreting the Scriptures. By the literal, he means the commonest, vulgarest and most unthinking acceptance of the record (or of the prevalent interpretation of the record) as divinely inspired and true in each particular. By the *ideological* mode, he means the *mythical*. And though he deprecates the allegorizing folly of Philo and Origen, and the substitution by Strauss of "a mere shadow for the Jesus of the evangelists," yet he hints the applicability of the *ideal* method to most of the miracles of the New Testament (as also to what he calls "the incarnification of the divine Immanuel,"), and declares that the spiritual significance and value of the ideas is the same whether derived from well-assured facts or not. Here is a

sentence strangely wanting accuracy of expression, but seeming to overstate the argument for theological freedom, and to impugn a theological position which the historian (not the literalist) is at least as free to maintain as the ideologist to propound his:

"Jesus Christ has not revealed His religion as a theology of the intellect, nor as an historical faith; and it is a stifling of the true Christian life, both in the individual and in the Church, to require of many men a unanimity in speculative doctrine, which is unattainable, and a uniformity of historical belief, which can never exist. The true Christian life is the consciousness of bearing a part in a great moral order, of which the highest agency upon earth has been committed to the Church. Let us not oppress this work nor complicate the difficulties with which it is surrounded; 'not making the heart of the righteous sad, whom the Lord hath not made sad, nor strengthening the hands of the wicked by promising him life.'"—Pp. 204, 205.

"That Jesus Christ did not reveal his religion as an historical faith" may be verbally true, because it could not become history till he had revealed and lived it. But that Christianity is an historical faith cannot surely be denied, unless the Roman empire is unhistorical and the destruction of Jerusalem ideological.

It is no wonder to us that passages of this kind should have directed the theological and legal attention of the proctor in convocation for the diocese of Ely to the writer of the essay in question. Nor, indeed, can we reconcile such opinions with the retention of a Christian pulpit. To the main doctrine of the essay, that churches ought to be multitudinistic and free from doctrinal limitation, we do not find reference made in any of the nineteen counts. But there is a count against the lax subscription advocated by the essayist; there is one against the ideological theory; and there are others (in the manner of those against Heath and Williams) which allege particular heresies of doctrine. Among these, the belief in God's justice and mercy to the heathen, and in the equitable allotment of future rewards and punishments till "all shall find a refuge in the bosom of the Universal Parent," are prominently charged in the indictment. Here is an abstract of its nineteen articles:

"The first three are formal; the fourth charges the defendant with having written and published the essay entitled 'Séances Historiques de Genève—the National Church;' the fifth and sixth have reference to the Preface to the volume containing the essay, and to the number of editions it has passed through, and are in precisely the same terms as in the accusation brought against the Rev. Dr. Rowland Williams. The seventh count charges that in the passages therein quoted from the essay, being pages 160, 161, 162, 195, 204 and 205, of the volume, the defendant had affirmed that our Saviour, Christ, was a mere teacher of morality and a moral reformer, and not also the revealer of God's scheme of redemption of mankind from sin and misery, and not the person through whose human life, suffering, death and resurrection, that scheme of salvation and redemption is wrought out,—contrary to the second, third,

fourth and thirty-first Articles of Religion, to the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, and to the Order for the Administration of the Holy Communion. The eighth count charges that in the passages quoted from the essay, at pages 175, 176 and 177, the defendant had affirmed that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were not written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and that they were not necessarily at all, and certainly not in parts, the Word of God,—contrary to the sixth, seventh and twentieth Articles of Religion, with the teaching of the Church, as set forth in a passage in the Homily entitled 'An Information for them that take Offence at certain Places of the Holy Scriptures,' the Nicene Creed, and 'as set forth in the Ordering of Priests in the Book of Common Prayer.' The ninth count charges that Mr. Wilson, in the passages of his essay at pages 176, 177, and 199 to 203 of the volume, affirmed that a clergyman of the Church of England was at liberty to hold and promulgate a metaphorical or ideal interpretation of any part of the Scriptures of the Old or New Testament, and that the defendant had therein denied the reality of any of the facts narrated in the Scriptures, and that contrary to and inconsistent with the sixth and seventh Articles of Religion, the Apostles', Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, and with the teaching of the Church as set forth in the 4th, 10th, 12th, 22nd, 23rd and 24th chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, 12th chapter of St. Mark, and 25th chapter of the Gospel of St. Luke. The tenth count charges that in the passages at pages 180 to 184 inclusive, the defendant affirmed that it was lawful for a clergyman of the Church of England to subscribe the Articles of Religion, receiving and understanding them in a sense other than the plain literal meaning of the words, contrary to the law of the Church, as set forth in the thirty-sixth Canon of 1603. The eleventh count charges that the opinions set forth at pages 185, 186, of the volume in reference to subscription, were contrary to and inconsistent with the said Canon. The twelfth count charges that the defendant had in the passages of his essay (pages 153, 154 and 157 of the volume) affirmed that every person born into this world did not deserve God's wrath and damnation, and that the condition of men in a future state of existence would be determined by their moral conduct, exclusive of their religious belief, and that such opinions were contrary to the ninth and eighteenth Articles of Religion. The thirteenth count charges that Mr. Wilson, in the passage at page 161, by necessary implication, affirmed that the Second Epistle of St. Peter was not the work of the apostle. The fourteenth article charges that at passage page 206, it was affirmed that after this life, and at the end of the existing order of things on this earth, there would be no judgment of God, awarding to those men whom He should then approve everlasting life or eternal happiness, and to those men whom He should then condemn, everlasting death or eternal misery, which was alleged to be inconsistent with the Creeds and the Absolution or Remission of Sins, which forms part of the Morning Prayer. The other counts are of a formal nature."

The above abstract is from the *Guardian* of Feb. 26, and is accompanied by an intimation that the conductors do not mean to give any lengthened report of the speeches in this suit. The similarity of the arguments to those already used in Dr. Williams's case, and "the crowded state of our columns," are the

reasons assigned for this abstinence from the usual fulness of report; but we can hardly be mistaken in thinking it a sign also of a very natural wish on the part of those zealous Churchmen whom the *Guardian* represents, that they were any how well out of the scandal and perplexity in which these ecclesiastical prosecutions have involved the Church. Even the *Times* (which represents the weariness of the laity as the *Guardian* does of the clergy) has reported the trial far less amply, less carefully and less correctly, than the penny daily papers. But there is, we imagine and we hope, no way out of it for the prosecutors except by going through to a decision of some kind that must surely leave its mark upon the National Church and State.

There were a few notable things said by counsel on both sides, and by the Judge, which we desire now to indicate.

Mr. Fitzjames Stephen, the junior counsel for the defendant, in the absence of Dr. Deane, opened his case.

To a not unusual form of theological unfairness in the construction of count 7, he thus alluded, perhaps with a little more indignation than the report conveys:

"The seventh count in the indictment against Mr. Wilson ran thus: 'That you affirm that our Saviour Christ was and is a mere teacher of morality and a moral reformer, and not also the revealer of God's scheme of redemption of mankind from sin and misery, and not the person through whose human life, suffering, death and resurrection, that scheme of salvation and redemption is wrought out.' The sting of that accusation was in its negative power, the word 'mere' in the first clause, and the negative in the second. Now, he contended that the alleged denial was entirely inferential. It could not for a moment be said, looking at the passage itself, that there was any denial."

Here is some common-sense theology (not new to our readers) about the distinction between the Bible and the Word of God as contained in it. The Judge's dry legal interlocution gave room for its re-assertion and enlargement, though coupled with the legal admission that "of course" nothing that had been settled by Act of Parliament as Church doctrine could be "knocked out" as uninspired!

"It had been made a serious charge against Mr. Wilson that in his essay he had used these words when speaking of the Bible: 'There is not a book, indeed a collection of books, so rich in words which address themselves intelligibly to the unlearned and learned alike. But those who are able to do so ought to lead the less educated to distinguish between the different kinds of words which it contains—between the dark patches of human passions and error which form a partial crust upon it, and the bright centre of spiritual truth within.' Now he (the learned counsel) admitted that that passage did convey that some parts of the Scripture were not the Word of God, and Mr. Wilson had instructed him to say that he did not shrink from that declaration in any way. The promoters affirmed that the Scriptures throughout were the Word of God; but it would be seen from 'Cruden's Concordance' that the

words 'the Word of God' were never used in that sense. Then came the question, Who wrote these books—God or man? It was clear that the Word of God contained the Divine will, and some sort of inspiration must be held. Then came a series of questions as to inspiration—whether God dictated or suggested the whole of the book—whether human agents wrote down exactly what they were told to write, or whether they exercised any discretion of their own—whether all the books were written under the same influence—and whether they were entirely free from error. Those were points which had been left open by the Church of England, and he contended that by their ordination vows the clergy were bound to investigate those matters as fully as possible.

"Dr. Lushington: Could you undertake to say how much you would strike out of the Bible, or in what manner you would proceed?

"Mr. Stephen: It would be left to the individual judgment. Anything that had been settled as doctrine could not of course be knocked out. No legal line could be drawn, and he thought it was not a fit subject for a criminal court."

On the other hand, Dr. Phillimore, for the prosecution, committed himself (and the Church as speaking through the promoter) to the most absurdly ignorant assertion of the absolute and equal truth of all parts of the Bible. By his showing, the clergy are bond-slaves:

"Dr. Phillimore held that such principles were totally destructive of the case of the defendant, which was that, if there was not such liberty in the Church as he claimed, there ought to be. With regard to the liberty of a clergyman to deny that portions of the Holy Scriptures were the Word of God, he admitted that he had some difficulty [in asserting] that it was not permitted; but the fact that the Scriptures were the Word of God was a principle which underlay the whole of the Articles of the Church, and was taken for granted throughout the formularies. It was a principle so generally agreed upon, that the Church had not taken pains expressly to affirm it. The Church, had, however, directed that the whole of the Scriptures should be read through during the year, making no distinction between one part and another, thus shewing that she held all scripture to be of like value; and the canons providing for this order designate the Scriptures 'the pure Word of God.' Mr. Wilson, on the other hand, taught that the Scriptures were partly the pure Word of God, and partly, so to speak, the impure word of man; partly the Word of God, and partly containing dark patches of human passions and error, which form a partial crust upon it; partly the Word of God, and partly adulterated by dark human error. It was absurd to contend that a clergyman was at liberty to decide for himself what part of the Scripture was true and what was false. If such liberty were enjoyed, what would become of the people whose souls were entrusted to the clergy, if they were to hear in the morning that a portion of the Bible was true, and in the evening that it was a myth introduced by human ingenuity, on which no reliance was to be placed? If such a principle were allowed, so far from the Reformation giving the people more of the Bible than they had, they would have less of it than they had before, and all the grounds of faith and practice which the Bible contained would be swept away."

We cannot object to Dr. Phillimore, either in law or morals, for holding Mr. Wilson down to his *ex animo* subscription:

"When Mr. Wilson was ordained, he subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and declared that he did so *ex animo*, and in their plain, literal, grammatical meaning, and the essay which he had published was a commentary upon that most solemn declaration. If this free system of subscription were admitted into any other society in the world except the Church, there would be an outcry in every direction, and the absurdity of the thing would at once be seen."

The Judge pushes Dr. Phillimore rather hard on his views of scriptural criticism and exegetics; whereupon the advocate shrinks from the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, but asserts their plenary *truth* without it:

"Dr. Lushington inquired whether Dr. Phillimore held that it was the doctrine of the Church of England that every word contained in the canonical books was true?

"Dr. Phillimore said he had never contended for the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures.

"Dr. Lushington said he was not inquiring whether the contention was as to the inspiration of the Scriptures, but as to the truth of the whole of them?

"Dr. Phillimore said he believed that the Church of England contended for the whole truth of Scripture; but Mr. Wilson, by his essay, destroyed the authenticity of the narratives of Scripture, and was a disciple of Strauss, who founded the system of ideology, which was to substitute ideas for facts. Either those statements which Mr. Wilson denied were facts, or the persons who bore witness to them were impostors. It was impossible to escape from that dilemma. If those and other events did not happen as the Scriptures described them, the gospel was a fable and a fiction and of no use to men. Was it for myths that Latimer and Ridley died at the stake, and pious men had led lives of self-denial?"

It was a pity that Dr. Phillimore was absent during the following colloquy between his junior and the Judge. But clergymen no doubt have read the Judge's implied rebuke upon their cloth for allowing themselves a latitude of interpretation in sacred things, which no lawyer, however versatile, would be allowed to attempt in things secular. The Judge also pushes Dr. Swabey into a corner about the *syllabic* truth of scripture, and forces from him the admission that it is "a matter of extent." Matter of learning and fair literary criticism, he had better have said; but that is the position of the other side:

"Dr. Swabey, in a critical and well-reasoned speech, followed on the same side.

"Dr. Lushington, addressing Dr. Swabey (Dr. Phillimore being then absent), said the eminent divines of the Church of England had interpreted the Articles of the Church in a very different way from that in which lawyers would have dared to interpret them. Lawyers knew well the rules by which they should be interpreted, but divines had assumed and had been allowed a much wider latitude. He wished Dr.

Swabey could tell him whether it was the doctrine of the Church of England that every syllable of the Scripture was true, and was so to be received; if not, how much might be rejected. If a verse might be rejected, then perhaps might a book be also; and he wished to know how far they might go. Then, as to miracles. If it was competent to deny one miracle, it might be competent to deny more or all. If Dr. Swabey could answer these questions he would not care how long he sat to hear him.

"Dr. Swabey thought it was a matter simply of extent."

Another day the Judge unmercifully reminds the promoters of the difficulty in which they have placed themselves:

"Dr. Lushington said he was in this difficulty, that the learned counsel for the promoter had not explained what he particularly wished to have explained, namely, where a line of demarcation was to be drawn. He had asked whether the promoter held that the whole of Scripture was to be received as absolutely true, and he had no answer. The Court must therefore draw a line of demarcation for itself."

Where will this line run, we wonder?

For the arch heresy of denying eternal torments, Mr. Maurice and the Bishop of London are cleverly made responsible together with Mr. Wilson, in the conclusion of Dr. Deane's summing up, which ended the trial:

"With regard to the charges made against Mr. Wilson in connection with the doctrine of everlasting damnation, he might remark that there was at present in the diocese of London, a clergyman who, occupying a high position, had denied that doctrine. Notwithstanding that denial, the Bishop of London had preferred him to a living.

"Dr. Lushington: Preferred him to a living or instituted him?

"Dr. Deane: Instituted him. The patronage was with the Crown. (Mr. Maurice is the gentleman alluded to.) The Act of Uniformity said that eternal damnation was the doctrine of the Church of England, while the Crown and the Bishop of London came to the conclusion that eternal damnation was not so easily arrived at as many persons seemed to imagine. The learned gentleman expressed his deep regret that he should have been compelled to make such remarks, arising as they did out of this very ill-advised prosecution.

"Dr. Lushington reserved his judgment."

And we reserve further remarks till this strange complication is still further complicated or resolved.

DR. HENRY SAMPSON'S DAY-BOOKS.

The anecdotes that follow are taken from Thoresby's transcripts from Dr. Henry Sampson's MSS. preserved in the Library of the British Museum. (Additional MSS., 4460, Plut.)

Of Mr. Edmund Calamy, Sen., General Monk, &c.

It was well known what pretence of love, kindness and friendship, General Monk made to Mr. Calamy, carrying him about in his coach, calling him Cos. Calamy, receiving the sacrament with him, &c. Mr. Calamy much importuned him not to dissolve the Parliament til the secluded members (after their admittance) had settled the kingdom. The General would by no means admit of that, but, said he, they will bring in the King. Afterward, when Mr. Calamy had been over at Breda and seen how they were betrayed, he was preaching before the General in his own church at Aldermanbury on a sacrament-day, and had occasion to speak of filthy lucre; Why, said he, is it cal'd filthy? Because it makes men doe base and filthy things. Some men, saith he, will betray three kingdoms for filthy lucre's sake, and threw his handkerchief (as he was wont to move it up and down) towards the General's pew. (This Mr. Howe saw and heard.) Afterwards, in private discourse with Mr. Howe, he said, It may be some men wil take notice of my speech about filthy lucre, and application of it to the General; but I could not help it; it was my duty to lay it home before him.—Pp. 39, 40.

Edmund Calamy, the ejected minister of Aldermanbury, was one of the authors of Smectymnuus; on the Restoration, was offered the bishopric of Lichfield and Coventry. He survived to see the city in which his life had been passed in ruins by fire. He drove through the smoking streets, went home sad and sickened, never left his chamber after, and died within a month. The story given here is told by Calamy, the grandson of this Edmund Calamy, in his Account of the Ejected Ministers, p. 6. But there the good authority of Mr. Howe is not quoted.

General Monk. That the destinies of a great country like England should rest on the decision of a person so little estimable, either morally or intellectually, as the man whom Charles II. (for once not ungrateful) created Duke of Albemarle, is one of the most remarkable facts in our national history. Lord Macaulay describes him as "cold-blooded, taciturn, zealous for no polity and for no religion."

Of Mr. Baxter and Dr. Owen.

Mr. Gilbert told a friend he had been to visit Mr. Baxter that morning, whom he found hard at study, and expressed himself to be very desirous that God would spare his life till he had finished some studies and thoughts he was about for the church of God. "Truly," said Mr. Gilbert, "I think you are in the right on't. You may do God more service here on earth than you can do in heaven;" which saying pleased Mr. B. mightily,

and made him paraphrase upon it. From him Mr. Gilbert went to Dr. Owen, whom he found grunting and weary, and wished himself out of this world. "See," said Mr. Gilbert, "how you two great men, Mr. B. and you, that you could never agree in your lives, cannot hit it in the matter and manner of your dying." "Why," saith the Dr., "what saith Mr. Baxter?" So Mr. Gilbert told him the story; "and," saith he, "I think Mr. Baxter is in the right on't." "Who is in the right and who is in the wrong," said Dr. Owen, "I know not; but I would that I was in heaven."—Fo. 26. *From Mr. M.*

Baxter and Owen. There were more controversies than one between these eminent men, chiefly turning on the terms of agreement and communion among Christians. Owen was the first to go to his reward. Baxter at that time was engaged in publishing a reply to some arguments of the other. He added an appendix, in which he bore honourable testimony to the character and talents of Owen; and, rising with his subject, makes an appeal, as in the name of the beatified spirit of Owen, in behalf of Christian unity and peace in the Church. "God," said he, "hath bid you pray, but not told you whether it shall be oft in the same words or in other, with a book or without a book. Make not superstitiously a religion by pretending that God hath determined such circumstances. O do not preach and write down love and communion of saints, on pretence that your little modes and ways only are good, and theirs idolatrous or intolerable; and do not slander and excommunicate all, or almost all, Christ's body, and then wrong God by fathering this upon him." Of Baxter's gentle patience, Dr. Bates speaks thus: "His complaints came frequent; but who ever heard an unsubmissive word drop from his lips?"

Mr. Gilbert was probably the ejected clergyman of Winchenden, in Buckinghamshire, a ripe scholar in both classics and philosophy, who spent the evening of life in Oxford, much respected by scholars and good men of all parties.

Mr. Robert Ferguson's Escapes.

When he had brought the Duke of Monmouth into the noose for which he died, he escaped himself by wandering up and down in the country. (When he was endeavouring to make his escape after the Rye-House Plot) he came to an inn in Uttoxeter on a market-day, when, two hours after, the proclamation was openly made for £500 to any that could apprehend him and others there named. A woman, staring him in the face as he stood by the kitchen fire, cried out, "Who have you got here? a traitor?" Upon which suggestion, the landlord, a Tory, took him into his chamber and thought to have made a prey of him, but his heart failed him, fearing the ignominy of betraying his guests. Late at night, in his chamber, he (Ferguson) overheard a man at prayers with his family, and liked what he heard so well that he thought he was a man to be confided in, and would needs send for him in the morning. This man proved to be Mr. Murial, then schoolmaster at Uttoxeter. He began freely to discourse

with him, and would have told his name, but Mr. M. forbade him. However, he conveyed him out of the town safely, walking with him three miles, and gave him recommendations to Newcastle-under-Lyne and Congerton (Congleton). At Newcastle, being weary, he hired a horse, and had a man with him to fetch him back: he therefore went to an inn to set up his horse first, and asked for the gentleman's house to whom he was recommended. The landlord has his eye upon him, and all having their mouths and thoughts upon the plot, designed to follow him. As soon as he came to the gentleman, he asked where he had left his horse. "At such an inn," said he. Then said the gentleman, "It is not safe for you to be in my house," and so packed him away presently. He had not been gone half an hour before the innkeeper and constable came to search for him. "He only delivered a letter and is gone," said the gentleman. So they missed their prey. He wandered further, got into Holland, came over with the Duke of Monmouth, and how he then also escaped must be wondered at. One would think he was reserved for great service; but he has shaken off his profession of religion, changed his side, and is imprisoned for the plot against King William, whence he will hardly escape if anything that touches his life be made out against him.—Fo. 25. *From the same Mr. Muriall.*

Robert Ferguson. This, we need scarcely observe, was the Judas of Dryden's great satire, a man whom Macaulay has drawn with moral features hideously coarse and revolting (II. 108, 109). It is strange to remember that he was one of the ejected from Godmorsham, in Kent. He was once an assistant to Dr. Owen, and wrote books on religion,—among others, a reply to one of the heretical books of John Knowles, another of the ejected ministers.

Of Mr. Rumbold.

He was an officer in Oliver Cromwell's army, a stout man, one that carried the old cause and the love of it in his heart. He was very lavish of his tongue, and was often so bold in speaking against K. Charles II., that divers told him he would be hanged for it. It is well known he came with Argyll into Scotland, and was there executed, his quarters brought to the Rye House. At his death he declared two things: 1st, that he was one of the persons that stood upon the scaffold at Whitehall at the time the King was executed, but did not the execution, which he declared that others might not be suspected or sought after upon that account; 2ndly, that the whole business of designing to stop the King's coach and murder him at the Rye House was a mere invention; that such a thing was talked of that it might be done by others he knew not; but that he ever spoke of it with design or preparation to do it, he utterly denied it upon his death. He was certainly a valiant man, and abhorred

base assassinations. He charged his son upon his blessing, if ever such a war was raised against the King, to be of the same side he had been. He was an Anabaptist by persuasion.—Fo. 27. *From Mr. Fryar of Clapham and his wife.*

Richard Rumbold, the proprietor of the Rye House, the scene of the alleged plot against Charles II. and James II. (See Macaulay, II. 104, 145.) He possessed "courage of the truest temper, fiery enthusiasm, both political and religious; and with that enthusiasm all the power of self-government which is characteristic of men trained in well-disciplined camps to command and obey."

Deliverances in Meeting-places and others of the like nature appointed for Divine Worship.

It is a great wonder to me, who have often been present both in houses for meetings and old churches, that none of them have fallen upon and destroyed the people that assembled; many of these meeting-places were old buildings, rotten houses, have fallen presently after the departure of the assembly, and none that I hear of yet have been hurt by them. I remember at the Countess of Exeter's, where Dr. Jacomb preached to a great crowd of people, the substantialness of the house was much suspected, and when the workmen viewed the house, they wondered it had not fallen upon them. It was secured by raising great iron pillars to bear up the roof, &c.; after which the meetings were continued there. My first instance shall be of the place where Mr. Oasland was preaching, concerning which I shall only transcribe his own letter to Mr. J. Owen, written upon my request, and dated from Wordley, June 24, 1698.

Sir,—I was preaching a good while agoe in a licensed house (ergo, it was in the time of Charles II., when houses were licensed) at Coseley, in the parish of Sedgley, in the county of Stafford, a large house with many rooms in it; but the room where I stood was largest, and under it a deep cellar. The room at the time was crowded, and at others full above, when I was there. It was thought afterwards, the room being large, the gunier (?) did bend, and so one end that was not far in the wall was drawn out of the wall, and down slipt the floor, and all the people slided down into the cellar, one upon the other. I myself had a little pulpit which slipt down, but I staid in it, but was not hurt, but felt a touch on one of my sides which lay on the side of the pulpit, but it did me no harm; the people in the other rooms came and pulled those that fell one off the other, and in a little time all were brought out safe, none had any great hurt or bruise. Some in the bottom were a little sensible of some small paine; but all went home, safe and in ease, quickly. We kept a day of thanksgiving after the house was set up, have preached in it ever since, only sometimes that house will not hold them, therefore I have preached sometimes out of doors. These are from your sincere friend, HENRY OSLAND.

Mr. Oasland was the ejected lecturer of Bewdley. Calamy mentions the incident here more minutely related by Mr. Oasland. When the

accident occurred, Mr. Oasland was preaching from the words, "The fathers, where are they?" the funeral sermon for Mr. Joseph Eccleshall, the ejected minister of Sedgeley. This and the anecdotes that follow have their value in fixing the early date of Nonconformist worship in the several places mentioned.

Second Instance.

At Loughborough, in Leicestershire, in the house of Mr. Oliver Bromskil, a meeting used to be kept on the Lord's-days after the sermons, to repeat, pray, confer or catechize, into which a multitude of the neighbours used to resort: the room where they met was a dining-room up a pair of stairs, and very large. That very night, after they were departed, the garret floor fell down, being overloaded with mault, &c. It miserably broke the floor and shattered the wainscot of the dining-room. Many of them had undoubtedly been knocked on the head, but God spared such as were about a good work. I have often been in the room since it was repaired, and lift up my O God! with thanksgiving for his sparing mercy to that people, as they themselves have often done.

Mr. Oliver Bromskill was the ejected minister of Loughborough. After his ejectment he was received into the house of Lady Bromley, widow of the Judge of that name.

Third Instance.

The market-house in the Haymarket where Mr. Baxter used to preach was sufficiently crowded, when on the sudden a great crack was heard in a principal summer tree, as they thought. This gave an alarm to the company, who hasting out, and hurting (but not much) one another, they all got out safely, amongst the rest the podagrical Dr. Sydenham. When it was viewed by workmen, it was exceedingly wondered at how it was able to stand. See the story at large in Mr. Baxter's Life. His wife upon this began to build a place upon the ground, when almost as soon as it was finished his liberty to preach was taken away.

Mr. Baxter's Meeting-house. The story is told in Baxter's Autobiography, Pt. iii. p. 171. Baxter, encouraged by Archbishop Tillotson, offered the chapel in Oxendon Street for parochial use by Dr. William Lloyd, the rector of St. Martin's. The offer was accepted to Baxter's great satisfaction, who said, "Be it by Conformists or Nonconformists, I rejoice that Christ is preached to the people in that parish, whom ten or twenty such chapels cannot hold." After being used for more than a century as a chapel of ease, the Oxendon Street place again fell into Nonconformist hands, the lease being taken in 1807 by a congregation of Scottish seceders.

Dr. Sydenham. For the last twenty years of his life, i. e. subsequently to 1670, this illustrious man was a great sufferer from gout. It is interesting to find him hobbling from his house in Pall Mall to join the conventicle at the St. James's market-house. It is Dr. Sydenham's distinction to have done for medicine what Locke did for philosophy; he made it observational; "he made knowledge a means, not an end."

Fourth Instance.

The gallery in the church of Dedham, in Essex, whilst the famous Mr. John Rogers was preaching, gave a grievous crash, which affrighted the whole company, the floor and gallery being exceeding full, as it used to be in his time. Yet it fell out, when it was viewed, the tenon was slipped out of the mortise, yet did (not?) break farther with that weight upon it. Had it fallen, it must of necessity have broken many limbs of those that fell, and the heads of those under the gallery, besides the lives of many by the fall of the great timber. See my notes on Mr. John Knolles, who told me of it. If any circumstance be omitted or diversely related here, it may thence be rectified, those papers being written presently upon his narrative—this out of my memory twelve or thirteen years after.

Mr. John Rogers. This eminent Puritan divine was silenced in the Laudian persecution. His life is given in Brooks's Puritans, II. 421-3.

Mr. John Knolles. This was John Knowles, afterwards of heretical repute, and a disciple of John Biddle. How grateful should we be could the other MSS. of Dr. Sampson respecting Knowles be unearthed! Knowles was at Dedham in 1636, and attended the death-bed and preached the funeral sermon of the Puritan father.

Sixth Instance.

The parish church of ——, in Salisbury, where Mr. Strickland, one of the Assembly, was preacher, had a large assembly in it on the Lord's-day in the afternoon. Some dust was observed to fall upon the heads of some of the hearers as they were at sermon, near one of the pillars. That very night the roof of the church fell down with all its weighty timber and covering, whether lead or tiles I know not, when nobody was in it. Had it fallen when the church was filled with people, how many lives had been lost! See more of this in the notes of Mr. Strickland, which his son-in-law, Mr. Rosewell, gave me.

Mr. John Strickland was the ejected minister of St. Edmund's, Salisbury, where he died, Oct. 1670, and was buried in the yard of the church whence he was ejected. The "Fifth Instance" of Dr. Henry Sampson has, we suppose, been accidentally omitted in the transcript.

Mr. Thomas Rosewell, the ejected minister of Sutton Mandail, in the county of Wilts, was one of the few men who escaped from the fangs of the infamous Judge Jeffreys. He was convicted on perjured testimony of high treason, but pardoned by Charles II., to whom the illegality of the trial was reported by Sir John Talbot. Mr. Rosewell's remains lie in Bunhill Fields, the *campo santo* of Nonconformity, the sanctity of which is unhappily now endangered.

Seventh Instance.

The church at Newbury, in Berkshire, was very old and decayed. There was an old clerk or sexton belonging to it that often gave them warning of it. His name was Timberman, and

he frequently shewed them where the timber was rotten, moving especially at the choice of all new churchwardens that they would see to the repair of it. They considered the charge more than the danger—were wont to tell him, Old man, it has stood all your time, and will stand all ours too, for aught we know. Within a week or thereabouts that the old sexton, aged about 80, was buried, the roof of the church fell; so that he lived not to see his prediction fulfilled. But that which is more remarkable is, that it fell on a Lord's-day, just after the people were gone out from the morning sermon. It was also a sacrament-day, and the people that stayed for the sacrament were all retired into the chancel, so that there was not one body killed or hurt. This from Mr. Grace, of Clapham, who assures me of the truth of it, and that it was about four or five years ago. I may be further informed of Mr. Taylor that lives in the place.

Eighth Instance.

Telling this story in the stage-coach, a gentleman there minded me of the gallery in Daintry church in Northamptonshire, which three or four years since fell in service time, bruised some, killed none. There were 100 in it, and many below it. It is good to be well employed. Set over against these when the hand of God has fallen remarkably upon other assemblies, it may a little open the eyes of men about special and distinguishing providences, and though these are not all in this age and country (as the former were), yet they are sufficient to inform us that in all ages and countries God has the same care of good men well employed, and indignation against bad men and their assemblies.

The first instance is the fall of Paris garden, related by Mr. Price and others. It was Jan. 13, 1583, on a sabbath-day. The second, of the fall of Black Friars, where the priests and jesuits had a conventicle, in a special relation and in Stow. The third, the fall of a house in Witney, related by Mr. Row, before his three sermons. The fourth, the burning of a playhouse in Dublin; see Mr. Baxter's Life. The fifth, the more miserable burning of a playhouse in Denmark; see among my papers from Mr. Woodcock. The sixth, at Risley, in Bedfordshire, where the floor of a chamber wherein many were gathered together on the Lord's-day to see a play, fell down, many were hurt and some killed. — Turner's Hist., ch. 107, out of Dr. Twisse on the Sabbath.

In common with all of Puritan training, Dr. Sampson was but too ready to interpret accidents, when befalling others, as judgments from the hand of God.

An honest Judge.

1693. Oct. 6. In this last Western circuit, there was one Mr. Parker, a gentleman of considerable estate, but a very great debauchee, that used to be rude and unruly in fighting, quarrel-

ing, &c., arraigned for a barbarous and cruel murder upon a man at a fair in Devonshire, before Sir Thomas Rookby. He had lately killed the man upon no other account than that he had affronted his servant. Both he and his servant went with drawn swords and a design to kill him; yet so great were the bribes given in order to saving him, that the Judge had an order to reprieve him in case he was condemned. The jury had received £20, as 'tis said, a-piece. The grand jury were long before they would find the bill. It is also said somebody (shorthand note here interposed) had £800 to solicit and procure his pardon at London. But the Judge having intimation of the underhand dealing with the jury, caused a new jury on the place to be impanelled, which found him guilty. At the sentence, both Judge and prisoner fell into tears. When the Queen heard of it, she demurred awhile, but, upon full hearing, left him to the law; so he was, after a week's time, allowed him to prepare for death, executed at Exeter the 2nd of this month. A rare piece of justice by an impartial Judge.—*From Sir Thomas Rookeby's mouth.*

Sir Thomas Rokeby's appointment has been before referred to. He was a Nonconformist. His son was pupil of Richard Frankland.

Wisdom of one of Charles's Pensioners.

Oct. 14. In the Long Parliament of King Charles II., one of the pensioners, who was a very dull man, though able to take money and vote, was imposed upon by a wag that sat next him. "Mr. Z.," said he, "I hear you say our Saviour was a Jew." "D—— them," said he, "that say so; I never said or thought so." But the gentleman, pressing upon him, made him very uneasy and noysy, which, when the House took notice of, he stood up and spake: "Mr. Speaker," said he, "here's a gentleman abuseth me grossly, and tells me I called our Saviour a Jew; I never thought so disgracefully of him." Not long after, it was told to the King, who, meeting Mr. Z., told him, "I hear you hold our Saviour was a Jew." "Not I," said he; "but Mr. —— would impose it upon me." "But," said the King further, "I hear you was for the oath of abjuration of me and my family." "Yes," said he, "God forgive me; for it was in the same sense that your Majesty took the covenant," which made the King go shooting out his lips and say, he was never so abused by a fool in his life.

It was told me lately by Mr. —— in Mr. Parkhurst's shop.

A Blunder of a Conforming Minister.

He was grown old, and his memory failing him, he said over the prayer printed before sermon, in which he was wont to confess all sorts of sin, original and actual,—sins against the law and against the gospel. "Put them all away," said he; "cast them

into the bottom of the sea [and then turning wrong, he lights upon another part of his prayer], whether they be most reverend Archbishops, the right rev. the Bishops, by what name or title soever they be dignified or distinguished." No doubt the Nonconformists would say, Amen.

Mr. Alsop, from a woman that assured him she heard it.

Of Self-murder, from Mr. Mayer's mouth.

Major Sallaway, a well-known and famous member of the Rump Parliament, a great professor, a preacher in his own family, mightily versed in the Holy Scriptures, yet, when in his latter days his son failed, who had involved him in bonds and great debts, grew melancholy thereupon,—one morning he rose out of his bed very early, went two or three closes off from his house to a pond, into which he threw himself and was drowned.

Dr. D. Williams's Rejection at the Pinner's Hall Lecture.

August, 1694. Mr. Daniel Williams, who was some time since chosen of the six preachers at Pinner's Hall Lecture, and that by a lot, was yesterday discharged by a party made against him. At the first choice, there were, it seems, 25 of a side, one half just for him, the other half for Mr. Woodcock; all agreed to put it to a lot, which fell upon Mr. Williams. It should have been cautiously observed whether fit to annul such a choice. But so it is, when men gather into partys and serve a private interest. One of Mr. Williams's friends went out before subscribing; had he stayed, that had been a 26th man, and so that had needed no lot: another, after he had deliberated long, wrote a great W, and yet considered longer whether he should make it Williams or Woodcock; at last he wrote Williams, which made it just even, which adjusted it for the lot, by which it was then determined, though now the force of it is thrown off and forgotten.

Dr. Daniel Williams was in his day the representative of the liberal party among the Nonconformist ministers of London. In consequence of his opposition to the high Calvinism of some of the body, he was made an object of cabal and attack by the Calvinistic party. The Lecture at Pinner's Hall had been established by means of a liberal subscription amongst the wealthy Nonconformists of London, and was hence termed the "Merchants' Lecture." It was delivered on Tuesdays. Dr. Daniel Williams was elected to the Lecture in 1691,—an appointment of no common honour, as he succeeded to the vacancy occasioned by the death of Richard Baxter. When the Antinomian party drove Dr. Williams from the Lecture, Dr. Bates, Mr. Howe and Mr. Alsop retired with him, and they united to found the lecture at Salters' Hall.

Mr. Woodcock. If this were Mr. Thomas Woodcock ejected from St. Andrew Undershaft, it would appear as if the opponents of Dr. Williams fought their battle against him with a liberal man. Mr. Woodcock was one of the founders of Nonconformist worship at Hackney, preaching at first in his own house, and afterwards uniting with Dr. Bates, the

friend and supporter of Dr. Williams. Mr. Woodcock was a gentleman of property, and it is interesting to suppose that he was connected with the Woodcocks of Hackney, from whom our great Milton chose his second wife, Catherine, daughter of Captain Woodcock. To her was addressed the touching sonnet,

"Methought I saw my late espoused wife:
* * * to my fancied sight,
Love, sweetness, goodness, in her person shined."

A Wise Man's Jest.

August. Dr. Benjamin Whitchcot, who was never pleased with gossiping and feasting, yet was forced sometimes to be at them, was wont to say, at the beginning there is altum silentium, but by and by, when the eating came in, there was stridor dentium, and the drinking caused clamor gentium, and continuing long at it left a stupor sensuum.

From his nephew, Mr. Jer. Whitchcot, at a funeral.

A Story of Vicissitudes.

August. My brother Woolley has often told a story of a person that had been long out of England, was cast upon the shore in Cornwall, where, being hunger-bitten, he opened a window where he espied a loafe, took it and ran away to eat it; but being apprehended, was sent to the gaol and tried for his life before Judge Hales. The jury was sharp upon him, brought him in guilty of the burglary. The Judge argued with them that it was but to supply his hunger, &c., that if he was guilty he must dy for it; however, they went out and brought him in guilty a second time; he again argues with them, and with much ado they acquit him. Some years after, the same Judge was rideing the circuit in the North, and meeting with over great entertainment by the Sheriff, chode him much, and told him what a bad example he had given. "Truly, my Lord," said the Sheriffe; "I should not have done so much to any other Judge, but for your Lordship I can never do too much; you saved my life!" "How so?" said the Judge. "I was arraigned before you," said the Sheriffe. "You sent out the jury again and again till they quitted me." "Are you the man," said the Judge, "that was arraigned for stealing the loafe?" "The very same man," replied the Sheriffe; "since then such and such friends are dead, a great estate is fallen to me, and I am in the post you see." *Penes authorem fides esto.*

A Northamptonshire Revival.

Sept. 5, 1694. I have often heard of the fits or possession of some of the hearers of Mr. Davys, in Northamptonshire; but I spake with one Mr. Fary, in P. N. R. (Paternoster Row), Mr. White's partner, who was an eye-witness of them. They were generally maids and young girls, who sometimes had fits at other times, but especially had them whilst Mr. D. was preaching; and at that time he has seen eight or ten at a time. They would

make a noise and direct their speech against him, cursing him, though not used to curse before: when they came out of their fits, could not remember what they had done or said. If they could get out, they ran till out of breath, fell down, and presently, then came to themselves again, would be sorry for what was past. Rev. Mr. Maidwell and others thought them from the devil. They are now in a manner ceased: but about two years ago, when he went about breaking churches and had so many admirers and followers, they were very frequent. His preaching is very affectionate, but very *rambling*.

Mr. Davys. Mr. Richard Davis, of Rowel, in Northamptonshire, seems to have anticipated some of the mesmeric or other arts of modern revivalists. He brought great scandal on the Nonconformists of his day, and was the means of dividing, or "breaking" as Dr. Henry Sampson calls it, many of their churches. His neighbour, Mr. John Maidwell, the aged ejected minister of Kettering, differing from modern saints and philosophers, thought these revivalist ecstacies were not from God, but from the devil.

A Satire upon Dr. Sherlock.

Regibus obsequium dum bonis obligat unum,
Jurat utrique unam, prodit utrique fidem.
Quid Mirum! Si sit semper jurare paratus,
Cum per quos juret tres habet ille Deos.

The same allegiance to two kings he pays,
Swears the same faith to both and both betrays.
What wonder! He that swears is always free,
That has two Gods to swear by more than we.

Archbishop Sancroft's Epitaph, found in the Athenian Mercury, September 24, 1694.

Lector Wilhelmi nuper Archi-præsulis
Qui natus est in viceno agro (?)
Quod morte cecidit, prope hunc murum jacet,
At qui resurget. Tu interim
Semper paratus esto, nam quâ non putas
Venturus horâ Dominus est.
Obiit Nov. 24, Anno Natalis Domini MDCLXXXXIII.
Ætatis suæ LXXVIII.

P. M. S.

William Sancroft, born in this parish, afterwards, by the providence of God, Archbishop of Canterbury, and at last deprived of all he could not keep with a good conscience, returned hither to end his life, where he began it, and professeth here at the foot of his tomb, that as he naked came forth, so naked he must return.

The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away,
Blessed be the name of the Lord!

Over his head, a stone with these words, viz.: "As the lightning cometh out of the east and shineth unto the west, so shall the coming of the Son of Man be."

Four Charities.

In my journey to Tunbridge Wells, July 30, 1695, I observed at four several towns four eminent pieces of *charity*. The first was at Lewisham, by Mr. Abraham Colt, who was very long vicar there, and at last died a bachelor; yet in his life-time he settled his charity, which was in three things: first, in seven exhibitions, each in £10 per annum, for so many scholars from his own schoole, or, if none found fit for the University in the judgment of neibour ministers of such vicine towns nominated, then from Canterbury. The second was the foundation of two free schooles for the town of Lewisham, &c.,—one for the Latin and the other for English. The former master to have £30 per annum, and the other £10, with convenient dwellings. The third was for six aged people in an almshouse, to have 2*s.* per week each. The settlement and care upon the company of Leather Sellers, London, who complain that he allowed but 20*s.* for the Mr. and Wardens at coming down, when they spend £5 or £6. See where the shoe pinches.

The second town was at Bromley, where Bishop Warner has built a stately almshouse for 24 widows of poor clergymen. Each widow to have £20 per annum during her life there besides her dwelling, and a chaplain £50 for reading prayers. They complain they begin to be ill paid. The chaplain has been long without his pay, and the widows about a year, which they can ill be without. I suppose the reason is because the feoffees are great men, and will scarce be persuaded to attend such an affair or meet together gratis. So here's another inconvenience to be thought of in the placing of charity.

The third town was Sevenoke, where one of that name (a foundling and bastard reported to be), by the trade of a grocer, attained to be Lord Mayor of London in King Richard the Second's time. He founded a free school and built almshouses for 19 or 20 aged people: when the lands were almost lost, some of the town recovered them in Queen Elizabeth's time, and therefore the inscription is of Queen Elizabeth: "Almshouses founded by W. Sevenoke." They were afterwards repaired by Dame Margaret Boswell. Each person has 15*d.* per week and some wood. The manner of building shews them to be very old.

The fourth town is Tonbridge, where there is an eminent free schoole of the foundation of Sir — Jud, committed to the company of Skinners, London, whose master and wardens yearly visit the school, see to the preferment of the scholars, and have augmented the means belonging to it. (See Dr. Willet, Fuller, Lambard's Perambulation, &c.)

I might add, the charity at Tunbridge Wells, where the Londoners principally and others that come to the Welles have not been wanting to express their thankfulness. Those of the Church have built a chapel, where are prayers read daily morning and evening, for the benefit of those that drink the waters during the whole season, by a chaplain, whom they pay. And there are also divers poor children taught to read by a person that lives thereabout all the year long. They are paid for chiefly by the Dissenters, who also give a good stroke towards the maintaining a preacher to the poor country people thereabouts for the three quarters of their absence; their own ministers supplying his room during the drinking season. Both these were first set on foot by Mr. Matthew Poole.

TRANSLATIONS FROM DANTE.

BY SIR JOHN BOWRING.

O SON of mine! there never was creator,
Never was creature, formed devoid of love
In its corporeal or its spiritual nature;
For all things came forth perfect from above,
And every erring and discordant feature
Are aberrations, and our wanderings prove
From the straight path where we were called to move.
Purgatory, xvii.

He who to ways of evil is betrayed,
Or wanders careless in pursuit of good,
Hath not Heaven's highest purpose understood,
Which in our very inmost natures laid
The seeds of love, whose harvestings are made
All virtues to produce, in plenitude.
Idem.

But tell me, ye who seem so happy here,
Do ye desire to reach some higher place,
To make new friends, to see another sphere?
A smile of light was kindled on her face;
As they replied, with most benignant mien,
In all love's primal beauty, truth and grace,
Brother! our wills are circled all serene
By charity's own virtue, and are blest
With what we are. *Paradise*, xii.

M. RENAN.

France, like our own country, has its theological troubles. There, as here, the spirit of free inquiry is doing its work, and producing, in quarters where it might be least expected, bold theological conclusions. What the writers of "Essays and Reviews" are in relation to the Church of England, that M. Renan is in France to the Catholic Church. What in England is slowly done by the tedious process of long arguments in the Court of Arches, and the lingering decision of a most reluctant Judge, is in Paris managed by a stroke of the pen by the Minister of Public Instruction.

The *Times* of March 1st contained the following remarkable communication from its French correspondent. Before proceeding to quote it, we must remark, that the correspondent's suggestion that M. Renan's speculations border on Atheism, is not justified by any known facts.

"The *Moniteur* publishes an order, signed by M. Rouland, Minister of Public Instruction, suspending M. Ernest Renan's course of lectures at the College of France, for that 'in his discourse delivered on Saturday last at that college, at the opening of the course of lectures on the Hebrew, Chaldaic and Syriac tongues, M. Renan professed doctrines which affect Christian belief, and which may produce deplorable agitations.'

"M. Renan was originally destined for the clerical profession. He spent some years as an ecclesiastical student in the College of St. Sulpice, in Paris, but quitted that seminary before taking orders. He subsequently devoted himself to the study of the oriental languages and of biblical literature. He has the reputation of being an able, if not a profound oriental scholar, and has published several works of much interest and research. He obtained the Volney prize in 1847 for an essay on the Semitic languages, and another in 1849 for a work on the Greek of the Middle Ages. He obtained from the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres a literary mission to Italy in 1849, where he collected materials for a work on the Hispano-Arab philosopher Averrhoes, who was the first to translate into Arabic the writings of Aristotle. In 1850, he was appointed one of the keepers of the manuscripts of the National Library; and, in 1856, was elected member of the Academy of Inscriptions. He has, besides, published *Essays on Comparative Philology*, which appeared in various periodicals, and were afterwards published in a collected form under the title of *Essays on Religious History*. He was very lately employed on an antiquarian mission in Syria, and the results of his labours still appear in the form of reports in the *Moniteur*. The merit of these various works in a literary point of view is pronounced by competent judges to be very great, and to shew an amount of erudition of no ordinary kind. On the other hand, M. Renan is said to have carried his speculations on revealed religion, and particularly on Christianity, to the utmost limit; indeed, almost to the negation of a Divine Being. His recent appointment to the Chair of Hebrew, Chaldaic and Syriac, at the College of France, produced a certain degree of sensation in the press, especially in what are called the religious journals. The opinion as to his peculiar views on religion was so general

that the Minister of Public Instruction thought it necessary to calm the apprehensions of those whose sons were to benefit by the lessons of the Professor, by declaring that M. Renan would not, in the course of his lectures, enunciate doctrines tending to disturb those principles on which a belief in revealed religion, irrespective of sect, reposed; but that he would strictly confine himself to ancient languages and history in a literary point of view. Still, the feeling was very strong, both against him and for him. The fact of the clerical journals having thought proper to sound the alarm was sufficient to call forth a counter-demonstration from their opponents. An immense crowd mustered in the streets leading to the college on Saturday last, and with loud exhibitions of party feeling. In fact, M. Renan, on his first appearance as a lecturer, had to be protected by squads of police, who, with some little difficulty, succeeded in obtaining a hearing for the Professor, who was cheered a good deal by his friends. In order that you may form some notion of the character of the lecture, I give the following passages from it:

"'Amid the enormous fermentation in which the Jewish nation was plunged under the last Asmoneans, the most extraordinary moral event of which history makes mention occurred in Galilee. A man, incomparable, and so great that, though here everything must be judged in a point of view of positive science, I would not contradict those who, struck by the exceptional character of his work, call him God, effected a reform in Judaism—a reform so profound, so individual, as to be a creation in every part. Reaching the highest religious point to which man ever attained—coming to look at God face to face in the relations of a son with his father—devoted to his work, with a total forgetfulness of everything else, and an unselfishness which has never been practised so highly—finally, the victim of his idea, and made Divine by his death—Jesus founded the eternal religion of humanity, the religion of the mind, disembarrassed of all priesthood, of all worship, of all observances, accessible to all races, superior to all castes,—in one word, absolute. 'Woman, the time is come when no one shall any longer worship on this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, but when the true worshiper shall worship in spirit and in truth.' The fertile centre to which humanity was for ages to refer its joys, its hopes, its consolations, its motives for acting well, was constituted. The spring of virtue, the most abundant that the sympathetic contact of a sublime conscience ever awoke in the heart of man, was opened. The high thought of Jesus, scarcely understood by his disciples, underwent many disappointments. Yet Christianity at first bore the sway, and, from the Infinite, it bore it over the other forms of worship then existing. . . . . Our religion will grow less and less Jewish, and will more and more repudiate all political organization applied to the affairs of the soul. It will become the religion of the heart, the intimate poetry of each one. In morals, we shall follow those delicacies unknown to the harsh nature of the Old Alliance; we shall become more and more Christian. From poetry, we shall demand a formula for that instinct of the Infinite which constitutes our charm and our torment, our nobleness at all events. From philosophy, instead of the scholastic absolute, we shall demand notions on the general system of the universe. In all, we shall pursue shading and finesse instead of dogmatism—the relative instead of the absolute. This, in my opinion, is our future, if the future belongs to progress. But shall we obtain

more certain views of the destiny of man and of his relations with the Infinite? Shall we acquire a clearer knowledge of the law of the origin of beings, of the nature of conscience, of life and of individuality? Shall the world, without going back to credulity, but following in its path of positive philosophy, find again joy, ardour, hope, lofty thoughts? Shall it some day be worth while to live; and the man who believes in duty, shall he find in duty his recompence? This science to which we devote our life, shall it render to us what we sacrifice to it? I know not. What is certain is, that in seeking the truth by scientific methods, we shall have done our duty. If truth be gloomy, we shall have at least the consolation of having found it according to rule. It may be said that we deserve to find it more consoling; but we shall testify that we have been towards ourselves of absolute sincerity.'

"I have already mentioned that, concurrently with M. Renan's appointment, the Minister thought proper to repeat the assurance that the lectures meant for the instruction of the rising generation of France, would not contain anything tending to sap the foundations of religious belief.

"'The books,' said the Minister, 'which serve as the text for the lessons of the Professor are in great part the sacred writings. Religion seeks in them its origin, and in them it also finds its prayer and its inspirations. Hence, in the faculty of theology, the study of the Hebrew tongue necessarily embraces traditional and dogmatical expositions which are the source of the belief held by every Christian community. But it is evident that this order of discussion is not in its place at the College of France, where the Chair of Hebrew is, so to speak, entirely laic. There the Professor, like all other citizens, should maintain the reserve and the respect due to the sacred character of the Bible. Leaving to the theologian the field which belongs to him, he occupies himself exclusively with researches in literature and philology. A stranger to religious polemics, he devotes himself entirely to explorations useful for the understanding and the advancement of the important knowledge of the comparative Semitic languages.'

"Such were, in fact, the conditions on which M. Renan accepted the professorship; and, evidently from the suspension of the lectures, the Minister thinks that these conditions have not been observed. From the few specimens I have given, you will be able to judge whether the Minister has acted judiciously or not. In any case, he shares the blame or the praise with his colleagues, for I understand that the order for suspending M. Renan's lectures was unanimously approved and adopted by the Cabinet."

M. Renan was educated in the tenets of the Catholic Church. We need not say how widely he has departed from his hereditary faith. He has long been accustomed to unreserved intimacy with some of the best and boldest Protestants in France. He married into the Protestant family of Scheffer,* his wife being niece of the illustrious painter, Ary Scheffer. The children are, we believe, brought up as Protestants. To whatever latitude some of M. Renan's opinions may now tend, it is the testimony

* Henry Scheffer, brother of Ary Scheffer and father of Madame Renan, himself also a painter, is just dead.

of those who know him well that he is thoroughly serious and in earnest, and that he has even a religious turn of mind. They say, and truly, that he is a man of majestic powers, gifted with equal talents and learning; that he uses fearlessly the intellectual rights of a man; and that he has done more than any living man in France to attract the attention of thinking men to the Bible, Religion and Christianity. They add, that it is indeed a disgrace to the country that a mere Catholic mob, hounded on by the most ignorant and fanatical of the priesthood, should be enabled to silence (even for a time) so distinguished a man. We believe we cannot give a better proof of the estimation in which the services of M. Renan are held, than by mentioning that, when he gave his opening lecture, the Rev. Athanase Coquerel, Jun. (who with his father well represents the Reformed Church of Paris and of France), stood by his side. By his presence and sympathy, this distinguished man doubtless intended to mark the feelings of the more liberal section of French Protestants. They do not as religious men fear the teaching of science. At every cost they are prepared to uphold liberty of thought and speech—their own and others'.

The spectacle of the delivery of that first address was, we are informed, very striking. In the body of the assembled auditors every variety of feeling was manifested. The Ultramontane party was represented by persons indulging in violent and even tumultuous demonstrations of opposition. The least moved person in the assembly was Renan. Amidst the tumultuous elements, he alone stood serenely calm.

— coorta est
Seditio, sævitque animis ignobile vulgus.
* * * *
Tum pietate gravem ac meritis si forte virum quem
Conspexêre, silent, arrectis que auribus astant
Ille regit dictis animos, et pectora mulcet.
Sic cunctus pelagi cecidit fragor.

A more signal proof of the power of a serene intellect over a tumultuous assembly has seldom been seen.

It is with great satisfaction that we learn that the interdict on M. Renan's labours is likely to be immediately removed. He proposes giving his class two lectures a week,—one a continuous commentary on Job, the book of Scripture which Renan has especially studied,—the other explanatory of the history and construction of the Semitic languages. We shall watch the progress of events with no little interest. If, as we have intimated, M. Renan goes on without further hindrance from M. Rouland, the Minister of Instruction, the fact will convince the Ultramontane men (a party as fanatical and blind to consequences as our own disloyal priests in Ireland) that there is no sympathy with them in the heart of the present ruler of the destinies of France.

INTELLIGENCE.

EVENTS OF THE MONTH.

Rev. Fletcher Blakely (March 1).—The month began with a solemn event, the burial at Moneyrea of the late Rev. Fletcher Blakely, the honoured and zealous minister of the place, to whose ministerial labours of more than half a century, not Unitarianism only, but the cause of civil and religious liberty also, owes much. We trust to receive from some competent pen a memoir of this good servant of the cross of Christ.

National Education: The Revised Code (March 4).—The Bishop of Oxford, in presenting petitions against the Revised Code, made an elaborate and thoroughly hostile speech, of which scrupulous fairness was not the most conspicuous attribute. He disclaimed the argument of economy, avowed that the present £800,000 grant must shortly be multiplied almost three times, and thought this a *flea-bite* in comparison with what we are spending on coast defences. So it may be; and if his arguments were satirically directed against the defence and war mania, it might be admissible. As a plea for unlimited education grants, the tax-payer, and even the Chancellor of the Exchequer, may feel its force to lie on the other side of the question. Unblushingly, the Bishop declared that the new Minute "must tend to do away with the religious tone at present imparted to education," and that "the grant, which at present depended on various conditions, would under the change be made to depend upon one;" and he spoke of a "substituted test," knowing quite well all the time that the proposed Minute, which makes the test of elementary reading, writing and arithmetic, more severe than before, leaves every other test just as it now is. He seems to have talked sheer nonsense in saying "that till the mechanical art of reading had been superseded, the process of acquiring information did not begin; *but the new system must tend to keep the mechanical part of the process before the minds of the pupils;*" and he drew a curious parallel between the eleemosynary character of the great schools for the rich and those for the poor, which will not be found universally palatable: "It might be said that the money of the country ought not to be spent in that way. But their Lordships would observe, that in the higher ranks of life the greater part of the money which provided for the higher branch of education was supplied from without. They had it in the endowment of their public schools and universities. But how were they to provide for the lower classes that assistance which the higher classes received, if it were not out of the sum which Parliament set aside to promote the education of the middle and lower classes of society?"

The *Times* (March 8) thus describes the qualities of the Bishop's speech: "He represents the prevalent tone of the controversy. Wide and sweeping in its assertions, strangely inaccurate in its statements, exaggerated in its language, careless in its assumption of principle, sentimental where it should be logical, and declamatory where it ought to be convincing, the speech of the Bishop of Oxford has nevertheless a certain power from the precision with which it reflects the very extravagance of ignorant alarm and uncalculating prejudice."

In one thing we are disposed to agree with the Bishop of Oxford and others, namely, in thinking that after so long experimenting on the part of the Council of Education, with discretionary powers of the most extraordinary kind, which were granted and have been continued as it were for experiment' sake, it is almost time that the Minutes of Education should be carefully revised and consolidated into an Act of Parliament. But there was no special obligation upon the present Ministry to take this step; the Royal Commission which gave rise to the new Minutes did not recommend proceeding by Bill; nor do we imagine that Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli would, if in office, have thought of doing so.

March 7. Lord Lyttleton renewed the discussion by proposing condemnatory resolutions, which, however, he withdrew, Lord Granville having repudiated the *vested right* claim of the certificated teachers, and Lord Belper having to a certain degree sustained it, expressing also a fear that the monitorial system may return.

March 12. In the Commons, Mr. Walpole gave notice of eleven resolutions to be moved on the 25th, the substance of which is, to condemn in detail almost every proposal of the new Minutes, ending with these two as standing orders for all future Parliamentary action:

"10. That in January of each year, if the Code be revised or any material alteration in it be necessary, it shall be printed in such a form as to shew separately all articles cancelled or modified and all new articles.

"11. That in the event of such revision or material alteration, as mentioned in the last foregoing resolution, it shall not be lawful to take any action thereon until the same shall have been submitted to Parliament, and laid on the table of both Houses for at least one calendar month."

Bi-centenary Celebration in Manchester (March 6).—Our friends in and around Manchester met to receive the report of a Committee appointed to devise a suitable form of memorial for this Bi-centenary year. The Committee's report was not accepted; but the meeting resolved that a fitting memorial of the ejected ministers of 1662 will be the erection of "a hall in Manchester, with a perfectly open trust, for religious, philanthropic and educational purposes; that the sum of £10,000 will be required for its erection, and that the present meeting pledges itself to use its best endeavours to obtain the necessary funds." It was probably owing to the non-acceptance of the Committee's report that the subscription did not at once begin. It is, we are informed, now in progress, and is headed by sums of considerable amount. The adoption of local forms of commemoration will of course diminish the amount given to particular objects; but the aggregate contributions will probably not suffer thereby. The two great things to be desired are—1, that the form of celebration has some actual relation to the Nonconformity of the ejected ministers; 2, that the effort, whatever be its particular object, be worthy of our position and means. A feeble celebration and a stinted offering would hold us up to the world as not worthy descendants of men who made such large sacrifices to conscience and religious truth.

Evangelical Church Intolerance at Sheffield.—The Rev. Brooke Herford has exposed, with becoming spirit and ability, the intolerance of a curate of St. Paul's church, Sheffield, under whose influence a crowded weekly meeting has been held for more than twelve months in the church school-room to pray for the downfall of Popery, Infidelity, *Unitarianism, and every other form of wickedness.* Mr. Herford called the attention of his fellow-townsmen to this proceeding in a Sunday-evening lecture, which, and the attendance on it by the public, were everything that could be desired. It is not often that bigots commit themselves so publicly as this silly curate, and give to Unitarians an indisputable claim on a public hearing.

Manchester District Unitarian Association.—At the annual meeting held at the Missionary Board room, the Committee made a satisfactory report of progress during the past year. At Blakely, the congregation had increased and the Sunday-school was overflowing. A new building had been erected at the cost of £600, the amount mostly subscribed by the congregation. At Middleton, the mission was making way; the Sunday-school had fifty scholars, and the congregation had borne all the expenses. At Miles Platting, the mission had suffered from the want of a suitable school building. At Pendleton, the mission had encountered much opposition, but had maintained its ground. A fund for the building a chapel here was in progress and already amounted to £600. At Platt, the congregation continued to improve, and the mission there had become self-sustaining. Measures are being taken to provide a new school building, much needed here. The congregation at Sale had placed itself in connection with the Association. At Dob Lane, lectures have been given. At Swinton, the loss of the late Mr. Boardman is severely felt, but the congregational plans are conducted with activity and in hopefulness. To aid Rev. J. C. Street, the able and most zealous missionary, the services of Rev. C. C. Nutter had been temporarily secured, and now Rev. Adam Rushton, of Padiham, has undertaken the duties of second missionary. The Committee were certainly entitled to say that the Association was doing a good and effective work.

Ordination at Derby (March 12).—Rev. W. Oates, late of the Unitarian Missionary Board, was ordained at Derby as minister of the Friar-gate chapel. The ordaining ministers were Rev. F. Bishop, Rev. T. E. Poynting, Rev. J. C. Street and Rev. John Wright. The chapel was decorated with evergreens and loyal and religious mottos, a custom better suited to a school-room than a place of worship. The addresses were appropriate and earnest.

London District Unitarian Society (March 14).—Another meeting was held to discuss the best mode of celebrating the Bi-centenary year. The best feature of the meeting was the attendance of Rev. Samuel Bache, Dr. Russell and Mr. Timothy Kenrick, who advocated the claims of the Ministers' Benevolent Society on the support of the Unitarian public, and its appropriateness as one of the forms of celebrating the year. The statements of Mr. Bache made a very favourable impression. An unsuccessful attempt was made to include the building of a London Unitarian cathedral among the events of the Bi-centenary year.

Schools at Swindon (March 15).—Mr.

F. R. Young is carrying on his missionary work at Swindon with great zeal and success. The day-schools erected behind his iron church have been completed, and the event was this day celebrated by a public tea-party, which proved a successful demonstration. Books, especially copies of the Bible, are wanted here, and will be thankfully received by Mr. Young.

Revision of the Liturgy.—Lord Ebury writes to the *Times* (March 20) to defend himself against the attacks and misrepresentations consequent on his efforts to give the clergy, by legislation, greater freedom in the use of the Book of Common Prayer than the Rubrics permit. He pleads that his desired reforms rest on the authority of eminent Churchmen, and refers to Overall, Sancroft, Sir Matthew Hale and others, who have protested against the repetitions caused by the jumbling together of services, the excessive tying up of the hands of our clergy in matters indifferent, and the wilful exclusion of thousands of unwilling Nonconformists. He says that he is now met in his attempt to give the clergy a large discretion in the performance of divine service, by the objection that, so utterly destitute are the clergy of that necessary qualification, such a permission would be quite unsafe. Besides the "Public Worship" Bill, Lord Ebury has also ventured on the bold experiment of asking the Legislature to modify the Act of Uniformity. He explains that he does not propose thereby to affect the uniformity of public worship, but solely to give ease to the consciences of the clergy, by receiving from them a general expression of acceptance of the Book of Common Prayer, in lieu of the definite assent and consent now extorted. He quotes the words that follow of a clergyman of great experience and long standing in the Church (name withheld):

"I cannot but express a most sincere and earnest hope that the motion you have given notice of in regard to the 'unfeigned assent and consent to everything contained,' &c., will be met in the Christian spirit in which I am sure you will make it, and that it will eventually succeed. Such strong and uncompromising language is not suitable nor proper in regard to any book of so large a size and so comprehensive a character. It has been said that the language put to candidates is intended to apply to the Prayer-book generally and as a whole: then why not let us have our assent in general, and not in such particular and definite terms? It is too much in a thinking age to expect of any man that he can *bonâ fide*, and with a good will, assent to every sentence and every expression. It is not necessary to demand it. A more general form of expression would satisfy every honourable requirement. The present form torments scrupulous consciences; it distresses tender consciences; it runs the risk of being interpreted in a non-natural sense, and so it does not prevent quibblers or indifferent ones from accepting it, while it may (and if what has been published about it be true), it does, by its precision and severity, keep out of the ministry of the Church of England many highminded and excellent men, who would be a portion of her glory and her joy. I believe that such are the sentiments of a vast number of the clergy, who do not like to put themselves forward, lest it should be said of them that they are fault-finders, and not true lovers of their Church."

Clergy Relief Bill (March 21).—The *Times* gives an explanation of the Bill introduced by Mr. Bouverie for the relief of the clergy. It enacts that any clergyman wishing to give up holy orders may solemnly declare his dissent from the doctrines of the Church of England, and that thereupon the Bishop is to record in his registry sentence of deposition of such person from holy orders, and from that time his clerical rights and disabilities are to cease. He is not thenceforth to be subject to prosecution or punishment in any ecclesiastical court for officiating in an unconsecrated building, or for committing any breach of ecclesiastical discipline as a person in holy orders. For twelve months after his deposition, he is not qualified to sit as a member of the House of Commons.

It is manifestly reasonable and right that a person desirous of purging himself of holy orders should have the power of doing so. As the law now stands, an avowed Atheist, because once ordained, remains a priest to the end of his life.

The Bill of Mr. Bouverie passed the House of Commons in 1849, having been in that House subject to the ordeal of a Select Committee. In an able article upon Mr. Bouverie's Bill, the *Spectator* pleads: "If a minister of the Church finds himself unhappily unable to continue his youthful allegiance to the established creeds and formularies,—if he honestly avow this inability, and if he be willing to forego the advantages and emoluments of the position he has attained, it is most unjust and most unwise to say to such a man, You shall not leave the ministry, or, if you do, you shall leave it with a prospect of idleness, dishonour and starvation before you. This, we say, is most unwise and unjust; yet this is precisely what the canons of 1603, co-operating with the 53rd Geo. III.

c. 127, say to any of our clergy who may have scruples about retaining their office and its sacred functions."

After adducing various arguments and authorities in favour of the Bill, the *Spectator* says, "The Bill can have few, if any, avowed opponents." But in the present temper of the Church, it is rash to presume on any forbearance or to ask for simple justice. The "English Churchman" takes objection to the Bill on several grounds—1. That it runs counter to several of the canons. 2. That it does not prohibit the clergymen seeking relief from ministering in any other communion. 3. That it does not provide for the contingency of a relieved clergyman wishing to resume holy orders. 4. That it does not assist Bishops in the necessary proceedings against those ordained clergymen who, while practically renouncing their ministry "and adopting and promoting schism," do not avail themselves of the provisions of this Bill. The "English Churchman" thinks it a grievance that the Church should be deprived of the privilege of harrying schismatic priests. It finishes its reasons by alleging that schismatic clergymen, "after doing their worst and making themselves liable to ecclesiastical proceedings, which the Bishop may have actually commenced at considerable cost, may walk off to the sessions and get rid of all their responsibilities and even of their very office *for a shilling!*" One would have thought that their departure would have eased the Church of a scandal. But perhaps the "English Churchman" means only to put in a claim for the Bishop's costs. At all events, the righteous indignation of the "English Churchman" would wish the schismatic to be mulcted of a heavier sum than the Bill directs, before he shall be free from "orders" which he no longer regards as "holy."

Lectures on Churchmen and Dissenters. A lively attack and defence on the subject of religious liberty and the relations of Churchmen and Dissenters, is at present going on in various parts of the country—at Manchester, by Rev. Jas. Bardsley and Rev. J. G. Rogers; at Birmingham, by Rev. J. C. Miller, D.D., and Rev. R. W. Dale; at Hartlepool, by Rev. W. Walters and Rev. H. B. Tristram; at Shrewsbury, by Rev. Dr. Hume, &c. &c. Some of the lectures are separately published (as those of Dr. Miller and Mr. Dale), and are enjoying a wide circulation; others are only reported in the clerical or Dissenting journals. The topics of some of them and the mode in which they are handled suggest a few remarks.

The celebration by Nonconformists of this great anniversary year only wanted one ingredient to secure its unflagging interest, and that is now supplied by the indiscretion of Churchmen and their public organs. It seemed so natural a thing that all classes of Dissenters should celebrate the courageous virtue of their Nonconformist fathers, that there was some danger of the celebration degenerating into formality. The appearance, however, of Churchmen interdicting the celebration, and publicly denying the relation asserted between the Nonconformists of 1662 and those of 1862, gives an unexpected interest to the discussion. English Dissenters are always sufficiently pugnacious. Sometimes they complain that Churchmen will not come and take up the proffered gage. But here Churchmen are the challengers. The result will shew whether their zeal has not got the better of their discretion. In several parts of the kingdom Churchmen are having their say upon the subject. They find no difficulty in getting eager crowds about them willing to hear and applaud their statements on matters of history; and cheers ring to the echo when eloquent clergymen pronounce the Church to be in danger, and call on all its friends to rally round it and save it from destruction. We may concede that the Church is in danger, though we may differ from Churchmen as to the source of the danger. The foes that endanger the Church are those of its own household, who by enforcing the penalties of the Act of Uniformity are seeking to repress free thought and punish the honest expression of individual conviction. On the Nonconformist side of the attack, experience shews that the Church is strong and safe.

But when Churchmen venture into the open field before the Dissenters' camp, and dispute the very ground of the proposed celebration, we may admire their courage, while we question their power to maintain their position.

If living Nonconformists may not celebrate the men of 1662, who shall do it? It would be something almost like effrontery in those who now indulge a profitable conformity, to claim to themselves the exclusive right of praising those who two centuries ago made painful sacrifices rather than conform. If in some respects the difficulty of conformity is now lessened to good men by the increased toleration and religiousness of Churchmen, there are other aspects of the subject in which conformity is less easy. Two centuries of tolerably progressive civilization and of unceasing theological discussion, and also the growth of hostile parties within the Church, have developed many differences of judgment,

many difficulties in the way of a perfectly conscientious subscription, which the ejected clergy knew only in part. But it is argued by Churchmen that modern Dissenters are not entitled to take up the praise of the ejected clergy, because they do not agree in all their opinions. On the same ground, these Churchmen might be proved untrue sons of the Church, because on a hundred subjects they have modified, on some they have altogether declined from, the opinions of their spiritual fathers. Happily, time is constantly bringing about *changes*, generally another word for *improvements*. But these Churchmen mean specifically that the clergy of 1662 were unwillingly ejected, and that in clinging to the principle or the desire of an Established Church, they and their successors in Nonconformity have little resemblance. But what is the fact? On this, as on other subjects, there were differences in 1662: there are differences now. Some modern Dissenters would not unwillingly join a National Church if its doctrinal requirements did not interfere with their convictions. Here we have the old, miserable confusion between general principles and particular opinions. With many of the special grounds of the Nonconformity of the ejected clergy and their flocks in 1662 we may feel no sympathy, but we give them credit for sincerity and we honour their fidelity to conscience. Their *conscience* may not be ours, but we cannot withhold our admiration of their *conscientiousness*. But we rather wonder that Churchmen do not see how the objection we are now considering injures their own cause. If the good men of 1662 were lovers of a Church Establishment, and were most anxious to be permitted to continue their conscientious and earnest ministrations within the pale of the Church of England, how unreasonable and malignant was the intolerance which forced these men into Nonconformity! But, again, were we to admit that there was an inconsistency between the feelings and the conduct of the ejected—granting that some of them wished to belong to an Established Church, yet remained to the close of their lives Dissenters—which are to be regarded as an index to their real thoughts, their wishes or their actions? Against their own habits of thought and the convictions of all their previous lives, they found the Established Church so hard and intolerant, they were obliged to leave it and enter on the untried and unwelcome experiment of Nonconformity. By pressing their objection to the celebration by modern Dissenters of this anniversary year, Churchmen in reality are playing the game of the most systematic opponents of the Church—those who maintain that all Establishments of religion lead of necessity to one of two results,—intolerance and persecution, or to practical indifference.

But there is another objection, of a rather delicate nature, which some of the Evangelical clergy have taken to the conduct of their Evangelical Nonconformist brethren. They say to them, "Why celebrate the founders of Protestant Nonconformity? Most of them were Presbyterians. They founded 300 Nonconformist chapels, and of them all but 18 are in the hands of *Socinians*. Will you dare to celebrate the doings of men who thus opened the door to this bad form of heresy?" There is something extremely ludicrous in this argument. It is from first to last tainted with bad faith. It is uttered by men who know nothing about the statistics of Dissent, and are so reckless as to say that which they do not know to be true. They adopt polemical tactics sufficiently clever. They do not deal in vague generalities which suggest their unacquaintedness with the matter in hand; but if they lie, they plausibly adopt the lie circumstantial. We will not aid these men in their disingenuous course by furnishing them with the correct statistics on the topic. It is enough to say that their present statement is far from the truth. The orthodox Dissenters, however, do not at all like this argument. The shell has been fired into their camp, and there it lies, no one choosing to take it up lest it should explode in their hands. They are conscious of their own inconsistent position, and of the wrong they do to the principles established in 1662, by limiting their common celebration of the anniversary to those who agree with them in evangelical faith. The right of private judgment, the supremacy of conscience, the disability of the magistrate to force opinions on any man,—these principles justify the Unitarian as well as the Calvinistic or the Baptist Nonconformist.

March 28. The debate on Mr. Walpole's Resolutions is brought to a close by the House being permitted to go into Committee, where the talk will doubtless be largely renewed. Mr. Bernal Osborne rightly enough said, the question is not a religious question at all, but altogether one of the breeches pocket. If education is to be a heavy national burthen, we are at least entitled to demand that we shall get that for which we pay liberally. The principle of "No instruction, no pay," is not in this instance a mere quack nostrum.